988

United States Department of State

United States Participation in the UN

Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1988

S 1.70/8:

READEX FICHE best. copy available

United States Department of State

United States Participation in the UN

Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1988

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 9712

Bureau of International Organization Affairs

Released September 1989

For Sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Contents

Acronyms and Short Forms xv

PART 1. POLITICAL AND SECURITY AFFAIRS

- Security Council 1
- General Assembly 3
- Peaceful Settlement 5
  - Middle East 5
    - Security Council Consideration 5
      - Situation in the Occupied Territories 5
      - Lebanon 8
      - Abu Jihad Killing 9
      - UN Interim Force in Lebanon 9
      - UN Disengagement Observer Force 10
    - General Assembly Consideration 10
      - Israeli Credentials 10
      - Situation in the Middle East 11
      - Question of Palestine 12
      - Israeli Practices in the Occupied Territories. 15
      - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States 18
      - UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East 18
      - Assistance to the Palestinian People 20
  - Observer Status of National Liberation Movements Recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or the League of Arab States 21
  - Conflict Between Iran and Iraq 22
    - Security Council Consideration 22
      - Chemical Weapons 25
    - General Assembly Consideration 27
  - Afghanistan 27
  - Cambodia 29
    - Credentials at the General Assembly 29
    - General Assembly Consideration 30
  - South African Policies of Apartheid and Related Issues 31
    - Security Council Consideration 31
      - Situation in South Africa 31
    - General Assembly Consideration 33
      - Policies of Apartheid 33
  - Other African Questions 39
    - Comorian Island of Mayotte 39

Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity 39
Hostage-Taking 40
Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question 41
Situation in Central America 41
Security Council Deliberations 41
General Assembly Consideration 42
ICJ Decision on Nicaragua 42
U.S. Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua 43
Cyprus 43
Korean Peninsula 44
Disarmament and Arms Control 45
UN Disarmament Commission 45
Conference on Disarmament 48
Ad Hoc Committees 48
Chemical Weapons 48
Outer Space Arms Control 49
Radiological Weapons 50
Comprehensive Program of Disarmament .. 50
Negative Security Assurances 50
Other Issues 50
Nuclear Test Ban 50
Prevention of Nuclear War, Including All Related Matters 51
Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament 51
Membership 51
Special Report to SSOD III 52
General Assembly Consideration 52
First Committee Disarmament Issues 52
Prevention of Nuclear War 56
Radiological Weapons 56
Disarmament and Development 57
Institutional Issues 59
Bilateral Nuclear-Arms Negotiations 60
Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons 61
Nuclear Freeze 62
Chemical and Biological Weapons 63
Comprehensive Test Ban 65
Cut-Off of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes 66
World Disarmament Campaign 67
Reduction of Military Budgets 68
New Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction 69
Negative Security Assurances 69
Comprehensive Program of Disarmament 71

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones 72
Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco 72
African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone 73
Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone 74
South Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone 75
Indian Ocean Zone of Peace 76
South Atlantic Zone of Peace 77
Israeli Nuclear Armament 78
Verification and Compliance 79
Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space 81
Third Special Session on Disarmament 82
Antarctica 84
Outer Space 86
UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space 86
Scientific and Technical Subcommittee 86
Legal Subcommittee 87
General Assembly Consideration 87
Law of the Sea 88
General Political Problems 89
Membership 89
Question of Peacekeeping 89
Peacekeeping Committee 89
General Assembly 90
Efforts Toward Strengthening the United Nations 91
Charter Committee 91
General Assembly 91
Questions Relating to Information 92

PART 2. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, SCIENTIFIC AND HUMAN RIGHTS AFFAIRS

Introduction 97
Economic and Development Activities 99
The Critical Economic Situation in Africa 99
Emergency Assistance to Jamaica, Sudan and Countries Affected by Hurricane Joan 100
International Development Strategy 101
Long-Term Trends in Economic Development 101
Economic Commission for Europe 102
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific 103
Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean 105
Economic Commission for Africa 107
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia 107
UN Development Program 108

    - Governing and Advisory Bodies 109
    - Secretariat and Field Organization 110
    - Program Development 110
      - Patterns of Development Assistance 110
      - Activities and Analysis 110
    - UN Volunteers 112
    - UN Capital Development Fund 114
  - General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 115
  - UN Conference on Trade and Development 117
  - Substantial New Program of Action for the Least Developed Countries 119
  - Commission on Transnational Corporations 120
    - Code of Conduct 120
  - UN Children's Fund 121
    - Programs 121
    - The Child Survival and Development Revolution 122
    - Funding 124
    - 1988 Session of the UNICEF Executive Board 124
    - U.S. Presence in UNICEF 126
    - Expenditures in the United States 127
  - Human Settlements Activities 127
  - Population Activities 129
  - The World Food Council 131
- Social Issues 132
  - Crime Prevention and Control 132
  - Committee on Crime Prevention and Control 133
  - Drug Abuse Control 134
    - UN General Assembly and ECOSOC 135
    - Commission on Narcotic Drugs 136
      - Draft Convention 136
      - Drug Scheduling 137
      - Other CND Action 137
    - UN Drug Control Agencies 137
    - Conference for Plenipotentiaries for the Adoption of a Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances 140
  - Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator 143
    - Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction 147
  - UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) 148
    - International Legal Protection 148
    - General Assembly 149
    - UNHCR Programs 150
      - Africa 150
      - Asia 150

            - Europe and North America 151
            - Latin America 151
            - Southwest Asia, North Africa and the Middle East 151
    - Social Development 151
        - World Social Situation 151
        - Aging 152
        - Disabled 152
        - Youth. 152
- Science, Technology and Research 152
    - UN Environment Program 152
        - Governing Council 153
        - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 154
        - Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol 155
        - Transfrontier Movement of Hazardous Waste 155
        - Biological Diversity 155
        - Regional Seas 156
        - UNEP in the General Assembly 156
    - UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation 156
    - New and Renewable Sources of Energy 157
    - Science and Technology for Development 158
    - UN University 161
    - University for Peace 161
    - UN Institute for Training and Research 162
        - Background and Structure 162
        - UNITAR in 1988 163
- Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms 165
    - Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Cuba 165
    - Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance 167
    - Human Rights in the Occupied Territories of the Middle East 167
    - Racial Discrimination in Southern Africa 168
    - Self-Determination 170
    - Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 172
    - National Institutions 174
    - Free Elections 174
    - Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention or Imprisonment 175
    - Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments 177
        - Rights of the Child 177
        - Human Rights of Migrant Workers 177
        - Rights of Minorities 178

        - Human Rights Defenders ... 178
    - Youth and Human Rights ... 179
    - Review of the Work of the Subcommission on Minorities ... 179
    - Violations of Human Rights ... 181
    - Human Rights in Chile ... 184
    - Advisory Services ... 185
    - Measures Against Totalitarian and Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination ... 186
    - Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights ... 186
    - Regional Arrangements ... 187
    - Science and Technology ... 188
    - New International Humanitarian Order ... 189
    - Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities ... 190
    - Status of Women ... 191
        - Commission on the Status of Women ... 191
        - First Regular Session of ECOSOC ... 195
        - Second Regular Session of ECOSOC ... 197
        - General Assembly Consideration ... 197
        - Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean ... 198
- Specialized Agencies and the IAEA ... 198
    - UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) ... 198
        - Introduction ... 198
        - UNIDO Meetings ... 199
        - Activities in 1988 ... 199
            - Program and Budget Committee ... 199
            - Resumed Industrial Development Board Session ... 200
            - Industrial Development Board ... 200
        - Investment Promotion Service ... 201
    - World Bank Group ... 202
        - IDA and IBRD Lending Program ... 202
        - Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency ... 204
        - International Finance Corporation ... 204
    - International Monetary Fund (IMF) ... 204
    - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) ... 206
    - Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) ... 208
        - FAO Council ... 208
        - FAO Regional Conferences ... 209
        - The World Food Program ... 210
            - The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs ... 212

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) 213
  UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 215
  Universal Copyright Convention 216
  Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission 216
  International Geological Correlation Program 217
  Man and the Biosphere Program 218
  World Heritage Committee 219
  U.S. National Commission for UNESCO 220
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) 220
  Administrative Organization 220
  Technical Activities 221
  Assistance to Developing Countries 222
  Revision of the Paris Convention 222
  Patent Cooperation Treaty 222
  Brussels Satellite Convention 223
  Registration of Audiovisual Works 223
  Protection of Integrated Circuits 223
World Health Organization (WHO) 224
  U.S. Participation 224
  Director General Election 225
  WHO's 40th Anniversary 227
  Health Issues 228
    AIDS 228
    Polio Eradication 229
    Tobacco 230
    Chernobyl Follow-up 230
    Pharmaceutical Issues 230
    Infant Feeding 230
    Drug Abuse 231
    Epidemiology 231
  Administrative and Budgetary Issues 231
    U.S. Government Payments 231
    Payment Incentive Plan 232
    Budget Reform 232
    Voluntary Contributions 233
  Political Issues 233
    Action Regarding Israel 234
    Trade Embargoes 234
    Assistance to the People of Afghanistan 235
    Southern Africa 235
    Chemical War 236
  Pan American Health Organization 236
  International Agency for Research on Cancer 237
International Maritime Organization (IMO) 238

- Assembly 238
- Council 238
- Maritime Safety Committee 239
- Legal Committee 239
- Marine Environment Protection Committee 240

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) 241
- Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against Civil Aviation 241
- ICAO Regional Air Navigation Meeting 242
- Future Air Navigation Systems 243
- Iran Air 655 Incident 244
- Facilitation of International Air Transport 245

International Telecommunication Union (ITU) 245
- Administrative Council 246
- Center for Telecommunications Development and Related Development Issues 247
- Plenipotentiary Conference Planning 248
- ITU Technical Bodies 249
  - International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee 249
  - International Radio Consultative Committee 250
  - International Frequency Registration Board 251

Universal Postal Union (UPU) 251
- Executive Council 251
- Consultative Council for Postal Studies 251

International Labor Organization (ILO) 252
- Governing Body 252
  - Financial Issues 252
  - Budget Reforms 253
- ILO Annual Conference 253
  - Financial Issues 254
  - Technical Agenda Items 254
  - Additional Resolutions 255
  - Other Political Issues 255
- U.S. Action on ILO Conventions 256

World Meteorological Organization (WMO) 256
- Organization 257
- Major Program Activities 257
  - World Weather Watch 257
  - World Climate Program 257
  - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 258
  - Stratospheric Ozone 258
  - Hydrology and Water Resources Program 258
  - Research and Development 258

- Technical Cooperation 259
- Financial Matters 259
- Voluntary Cooperation Program 259
- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) 260
  - General Background 260
  - IAEA Programs 261
    - Safeguards 261
    - Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection 262
    - Technical Cooperation 263
    - Research and Isotopes 264
  - Special Issues 264
    - Nuclear Liability 264
    - Environmental Issues 265
    - Dumping of Nuclear Wastes 265
    - Arms Control 265
  - Budgetary Matters 266
  - Political Issues 266
    - Israeli Nuclear Activities 266
    - South African Membership 267
  - General Assembly 267

PART 3. TRUSTEESHIP AND DEPENDENT AREAS

- Trusteeship Council 269
- Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands 270
- U.S. Territories 271
  - Special Committee Consideration 271
  - American Samoa 271
  - Guam 272
  - U.S. Virgin Islands 272
  - General Assembly Action 273
- Namibia 273
  - Security Council Consideration 273
  - General Assembly Consideration 275
- Puerto Rico 278
- Western Sahara 278
- New Caledonia 280
- Other Questions 280
  - Fourth Committee Resolutions 280
  - Plenary Action 281

PART 4. LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

- Introduction 283
- International Terrorism 283
- International Court of Justice 284
  - Nicaragua v. United States of America 284
  - Case Concerning Elettronica Sicula, S.p.A. (ELSI) United States v. Italy 284
- International Law Commission 285

Work of the Commission's 40th Session 285
General Assembly Action 287
UN Commission on International Trade Law 287
Entry Into Force of UNCITRAL-Prepared Conventions 287
The Commission's 21st Plenary Session 288
UNCITRAL's 1988 Work Program 288
Consideration by the Sixth (Legal) Committee 289
Action by the General Assembly 290
Draft Code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind 290
Protection of Diplomats 291
International Convention Against Mercenary Activities 291
Strengthening International Security 292
Good-Neighborliness Between States 296
Host Country Relations 297
Parking Problem 299
ICJ Advisory Opinion on the PLO Observer Mission in New York 300
Denial of Visa to Arafat 300
Protection of Persons Under Detention or Imprisonment 300
Development of Principles Concerning International Economic Relations 301

PART 5. BUDGET, ADMINISTRATION AND INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

Introduction 303
UN Reform 305
Current Financial Crisis of the UN 307
UN Budget. 308
Audit Reports 311
Financing Peacekeeping Operations 313
Scales of Assessment 316
Committee for Program and Coordination 318
Proposed Outline for the UN Program Budget for 1990–1991 318
Revisions to the Medium-Term Plan 319
Program Performance for 1986–1987 320
Review of Evaluation Activities 321
Cross-Organizational Program Analyses 322
Joint Inspection Unit 323
Committee on Conferences 326
International Civil Service Commission 328
Personnel Questions 329
UN Pension System 330
Employment of Americans 331

APPENDICES

1. Address by President Reagan at the 43rd Regular Session of the General Assembly 335
2. Principal Organs of the United Nations 345
    - General Assembly 345
    - Security Council 348
    - Trusteeship Council 348
    - Economic and Social Council 348
    - International Court of Justice 349
3. United States Missions 351
    - U.S. Mission to the United Nations, New York 1988 351
    - U.S. Mission to the European Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations, Geneva 352
    - Other U.S. Missions 352
4. United States Representatives 353
    - General Assembly 353
    - Security Council 355
    - Trusteeship Council 355
    - Economic and Social Council and Related Bodies 355
    - Specialized Agencies and IAEA 358
5. Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations 361

Acronyms and Short Forms

AID	U.S. Agency for International Development
ACABQ	Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
ACC	Administrative Committee on Coordination
Committee of 24	Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples
CD	Conference on Disarmament
CSCE	Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe
EC	European Community
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
ESCWA	Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
G-77	Group of 77
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
IDA	International Development Association
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labor Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
NASA	U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OAS	Organization of American States
OAU	Organization of African Unity
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organization
UNCITRAL	UN Commission of International Trade Law

UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
UNDC	UN Disarmament Commission
UNDOF	UN Disengagement Observer Force
UNDP	UN Development Program
UNEF	UN Emergency Force
UNEP	UN Environment Program
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFICYP	UN Force in Cyprus
UNHCR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNIDO	UN Industrial Development Organization
UNIFIL	UN Interim Force in Lebanon
UNITAR	UN Institute for Training and Research
UNRWA	UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UNSCEAR	UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation
UPU	Universal Postal Union
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization

Part 1

Political and Security Affairs

Since the United Nations was founded in 1945, its primary objective has been the promotion of international peace and security. This remains the centerpiece of the UN system.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The Charter gives the Security Council and the General Assembly authority to consider threats to the peace. Primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security rests with the Security Council. The Charter authorizes the Council to act to achieve the peaceful settlement of disputes (Chapter VI), and to deal with threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression (Chapter VII). The Council can only make recommendations for actions on matters raised under Chapter VI. In areas covered by Chapter VII, however, it may take decisions—including imposition of collective political, economic and military sanctions—which, in theory at least, are binding on all member states.

The 15-member Council functions continuously, meeting as necessary. The Charter gives a special role to the five Permanent Members—China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and the United States. A negative vote by a Permanent Member constitutes a veto of any substantive Council action, in the event that such action (usually a draft resolution) receives at least nine positive votes. Council decisions on procedural matters require nine or more positive votes for adoption. They cannot be vetoed, but in these instances the Council often operates by consensus.

The 10 nonpermanent members are elected by the General Assembly; by tradition they represent geographic regions. They serve overlapping 2-year terms; five members are elected each year. The countries finishing their term of membership in 1988 were: Argentina, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan and Zambia. The five new members for the 1988–1989 term are: Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal and Yugoslavia; for the 1989–1990 term: Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, Finland and Malaysia.

The Council has created UN peacekeeping and peace-monitoring operations to help carry out its responsibilities. Seven such units existed in 1988: the UN

Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP); the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights between Israel and Syria; the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), stationed in southern Lebanon; the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), located in Israel and other Mideast countries; the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP); the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) located in Iran and Iraq; and the UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) located in Afghanistan and Pakistan. These operations were launched and deployed under the authorization of the Council; that authorization remains the basis for their existence. UNIIMOG and UNGOMAP were created by the Council and deployed in 1988. The UN Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM), to monitor the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, was also created in 1988 but has not been deployed. In 1978 the Council also authorized creation of a UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to help the Special Representative of the Secretary General ensure the early independence of Namibia through free and fair elections. Consultations on the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 were held in late 1988 as a result of the Namibia settlement agreement.

The Security Council held 55 meetings in 1988, compared to 47 in 1987. Most of these meeting concerned the Middle East and Southern Africa. The Council passed 20 resolutions (13 in 1987); 17 were adopted unanimously. The United States voted for 17 of these resolutions and abstained on 3. Dealing with peacekeeping forces, the Council passed resolutions which renewed UNIFIL twice (January 29, July 29), UNDOF twice (May 31, November 29), and UNFICYP twice (June 15, December 15) and created UNGOMAP, UNIIMOG and UNAVEM. The United States supported the creation of the three new peacekeeping forces and all the mandate extensions. In addition, the Security Council unanimously approved the appointment of the Secretary General's Special Representative to help resolve the Western Sahara conflict.

Seven vetoes were cast in the Council in 1988. Six of these were by the United States: three on the Occupied Territories, two on the Middle East and one on South Africa. The United Kingdom joined the United States in vetoing a resolution on South Africa.

The Council convened nine times on African issues, eight involving South Africa and one on Namibia. The United States, joined by the United Kingdom, abstained on one of the 3 resolutions adopted on South Africa. The Council President issued a statement marking the 10th anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 on Namibia.

Security Council consideration of the Iran-Iraq war focused on the establishment of a peacekeeping force and halting the use of chemical weapons. The United States supported these resolutions. The United States also joined consensus on a resolution expressing deep distress at the downing of an Iranian civil aircraft by the *USS Vincennes*.

On other Middle Eastern issues, the Council adopted a resolution expressing grave concern over the situation in the occupied Palestinian territories and calling upon Israel to refrain from deporting any Palestinian civilians and to abide by the Geneva Convention relating to the protection of civilian persons in time of war. The United States voted in favor of this resolution but abstained on a second resolution on the subject because it was needlessly repetitive. The United States also abstained on a resolution on the alleged Israeli attack against Tunisian territory resulting in the death of PLO leader Khalil el Wazir (Abu Jihad). On terrorism, the Security Council unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the release of U.S. Lieutenant Colonel William Higgins who was taken hostage in Southern Lebanon while on an assignment for UNTSO.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Except for the anomalous situation of the Delegation of South Africa, whose credentials have not been accepted since 1970, all UN member states are currently represented in the General Assembly. The Assembly meets annually from mid-September to late December. After 3 weeks of general debate, the work of the Assembly takes place in seven main committees and in plenary. Political issues are handled in several forums: arms control and disarmament in the First Committee; broad political issues in the Special Political Committee and the plenary; human rights in the Third Committee; and dependent territories and decolonization questions in the Fourth Committee.

The 43rd General Assembly convened on September 20, and recessed on December 22. President Reagan addressed the plenary on September 26, the sixth year in a row that he has spoken to the fall session of the General Assembly. Of the 383 resolutions and decisions adopted by the 43rd General Assembly in 1988, the United States joined consensus on 244, abstained on 36, did not participate on 3, and cast yes or no votes on 126. The Assembly decided 139 issues by vote.

A major goal of the United States at the 43rd General Assembly was to maintain the gains made during the 42nd General Assembly against the practice of name-calling: i.e., gratuitous criticism of the United States by name in Assembly resolutions. There were only two instances of name-calling: one resolution on apartheid and one on the Middle East. The United States called for separate paragraph votes to delete these references, but was unsuccessful and they remained in the resolutions.

The Middle East and southern Africa issues remained an important part of the political agenda of the 43rd General Assembly and, in addition, Afghanistan, Cambodia and the Soviet proposal for a Comprehensive System for International Peace and Security (CSIS) continued to be major issues.

The United States supported a plenary decision to reject by a record margin the challenge to Israeli credentials. The United States joined a consensus resolution on Afghanistan and a record General Assembly majority adopting a resolution calling for an end to Vietnam's occupation of Cambodia. In 1988 there was no challenge to the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea.

The United States voted against the Soviet-sponsored resolution on the CSIS because in the U.S. view, the initiative represented an effort to undermine the UN Charter. The CSIS resolution was adopted with the affirmative votes of three-fifths of Assembly members. The gain over the 1987 showing, when less than half the membership supported the resolution, was purchased at the cost of significant cuts in the language of the resolution, thereby vitiating it to a considerable extent.

Consideration of Antarctica failed to restore the consensus approach that had prevailed for several years before breaking down in 1985. Joined by many countries from all regional groups, including all of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, the United States declined to participate in voting on the three Antarctica resolutions. The effect of these resolutions, if not their intent, would be to undermine the Antarctic treaty system.

The United States voted against two resolutions related to U.S. policy regarding Nicaragua, both of which passed, but joined consensus on the resolution on peace in Central America. The United States cosponsored the consensus resolution on cooperation between the Organization of American States and the United Nations. It also supported successful resolutions on the Falklands (Malvinas) issue and cooperation between the United Nations and the Latin American economic system.

On the Middle East, the Assembly adopted by large margins 32 resolutions, most importantly 3 dealing with the general situation in the region, 5 on the question of Palestine, 7 on Israeli practices in the occupied territories, 10 on UNRWA and 2 on the observer status of the PLO and SWAPO. Additionally, single resolutions were adopted on the Palestinian uprising (*intifada*), cooperation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States, assistance to the Palestinian people, Israeli nuclear armament and establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. With the exception of the resolution on the nuclear-weapon-free zone, on which the United States joined consensus, and four of the UNRWA resolutions which it supported (one of which traditionally is sponsored by the United States), the United States voted against or abstained on all the Middle East resolutions because their lack of balance and strident tone did not promote the quest for a just and lasting peace in the region.

The Assembly adopted 16 resolutions on southern Africa, 11 under the item, "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa" and 5 under the item the "Question of Namibia." While restating firm opposition to apartheid in any form, the United States abstained on or voted against nine resolutions on

South Africa because of their extreme confrontational tone. It joined consensus on two resolutions on apartheid. In line with its standard practice as a member of the Western Contact Group, the United States abstained on the five resolutions involving Namibia.

In the Fourth Committee, the United States achieved its objectives of blocking any General Assembly initiatives on Puerto Rico or Micronesia because neither is a proper subject for consideration by that forum. The Committee and the Plenary approved noncontentious resolutions on American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands and Guam.

Arms control, disarmament and international security matters once again generated the largest number of resolutions in the 43rd General Assembly. The General Assembly adopted 73 resolutions and 2 decisions recommended by the First Committee. The United States participated actively in these deliberations, mobilizing support successfully behind resolutions dealing with the threat of chemical weapons and its own initiative on compliance with international arms control agreements.

PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Middle East

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

Situation in the Occupied Territories

Against the backdrop of continuing unrest in the West Bank and Gaza sparked by the Palestinian uprising (*intifada*) that began in December 1987, the Security Council met to consider the situation in the occupied territories on several occasions during 1988. Four draft resolutions were considered; two were adopted and two others failed because of negative votes by a permanent member (U.S.).

On January 3 the Israeli Government announced its intention to deport nine Palestinian residents of the territories accused of inciting violence. In response, the Security Council on January 5 voted unanimously 15 (U.S.) to 0 to adopt resolution 607. This resolution, sponsored by the non-aligned group, reaffirmed the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the occupied territories and called on Israel to abide by its obligations under the Convention and to refrain from deporting Palestinians. In explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador Okun said that, while the United States recognizes Israel's responsibility to maintain order in the territories, actions of the occupying power must be consistent with international law and practice. He continued:

> The view of the United States is that deportation of individuals from the occupied territories is a violation of Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits individual or mass forcible transfers "regardless of their motive." The United States further

> believes that such harsh measures are unnecessary to maintain order. They also serve to increase tension rather than contribute to the creation of a political atmosphere conducive to reconciliation and negotiation.

When Israel nonetheless proceeded to carry out the deportation of four Palestinians to Lebanon, the Security Council met again to consider another non-aligned draft resolution. On January 14 the Council voted (14 to 0 with 1 abstention (U.S.)) to adopt resolution 608, which expressed deep regret that Israel had acted in defiance of the Council and which called on Israel to rescind the deportation orders and to ensure the safe and immediate return to the territories of those previously deported.

Ambassador Walters, noting that the U.S. position on the issue had been made clear in our vote on resolution 607, expressed regret at the Israeli decision and urged Israel to avoid further deportations. He explained that the United States abstained on resolution 608 because "we believe that repeatedly raising this issue in the Security Council does not assist the process of restoring calm to the territories or in addressing the problems that have contributed to the recent disturbances."

In accordance with Security Council resolution 605 (adopted December 22, 1987), the Secretary General on January 22 presented to the Council a report on the situation in the occupied territories, including recommendations on measures to ensure the safety and protection of Palestinians in the area. This report, based on a visit to the region January 8–17 by UN Under Secretary for Political Affairs Marrack Goulding, highlighted: (1) the need for an international effort to persuade Israel to accept applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories, and (2) the urgency of achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting Middle East settlement by means of an international conference under UN auspices.

Responding to the report, the non-aligned group proposed a draft resolution that, *inter alia*, called on Israel "to desist forthwith from its policies and practices which violate the human rights of the Palestinian people" and affirmed the urgent need to achieve a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict "under the auspices of the United Nations." After several meetings, a vote was held on February 1. The draft resolution failed because of a veto by the United States, 14 to 1 (U.S.). Ambassador Okun explained that the United States voted against the draft because the Council had already been convened too many times to consider unhelpful initiatives concerning this issue, and that the draft was an untimely effort to involve the Council in issues that were best dealt with through diplomatic channels. He noted:

> The United States believes the three resolutions adopted during this period amply expressed the Council's views on this subject. Further resolutions at this time are, in our view, redundant and inappropriate, at best. At worst, they can detract from diplomatic efforts underway which are designed to address in a practical way the current unrest, which is a symptom of failure to achieve a solution of the Palestinian issue, and the larger goal of a just and lasting peace for all concerned . . . We disapprove . . . of the Council's

effort, in this instance, to address the current unrest and Israel's response in a fruitless and redundant way and to direct a negotiating process before agreement is reached among the parties on appropriate auspices for negotiations.

Security Council debate on the occupied territories resumed in April in response to additional deportations and continuing violence in the area, in particular an April 1 confrontation on the Temple Mount between Israeli authorities and Sheikh Saad Eddin El-Alami, Head of the Supreme Islamic Council in Jerusalem. A draft resolution, sponsored by the non-aligned, urged that Israel abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention and desist from deporting Palestinian residents of the territories. Additionally, it condemned "those policies and practices of Israel, the occupying power, which violate the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories."

On April 15 the United States vetoed the draft, 14 to 1 (U.S.). In explanation of vote, Ambassador Okun reaffirmed the U.S. position on the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories and our opposition to deportations. Noting that this was the fifth time since December 1987 that the Council had taken up the issue, he pointed out that the United States was engaged in a major diplomatic effort with the concerned parties to launch direct negotiations. He said the United States did "not regard this recurrent recourse to the Council as befitting its authority and prestige." The proposed resolution, like its predecessor of February 1, was "redundant and inappropriate: its broad and sweeping condemnation of Israel contains not a scintilla of balance; it contains no appeal or request for calm."

In August the PLO submitted a letter to the Security Council President protesting a recent series of Israeli security measures in the occupied territories, including shootings, curfews, electricity and water cuts, and a press ban. At the urging of several non-aligned members, the Council President proposed a consensus statement to be issued on behalf of the entire Council. After several days of negotiations, members reached agreement on a text which was issued by the President on August 26. The statement expressed grave concern over continued deterioration of the situation in the territories, cited profound concern over Israel's persistence "in continuing its policy of deporting Palestinian civilians in contravention of Security Council resolutions and the Fourth Geneva Convention," and noted that the situation had grave consequences for endeavors to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting Middle East peace. The United States entered the following reservation:

> While the United States is prepared to join consensus on this presidential statement, I wish to reiterate our objection to the phrases "Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem" and "occupied Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem." We consider that these phrases describe the territories demographically, are limited to territories occupied in 1967, and do not prejudge their status, which can only be resolved through negotiations. We are convinced that Jerusalem must remain undivided, but that its final status should be decided through negotiations.

Lebanon

The unsettled situation in southern Lebanon continued to spawn incidents of violence that prompted Security Council consideration on several occasions during the year.

In January the Lebanese Government submitted a letter to the Security Council President complaining about various Israeli activities in southern Lebanon, including recent military raids and blockades of two villages in the area. The non-aligned group proposed a draft resolution that strongly deplored "the repeated Israeli attacks against Lebanese territory and all other measures and practices against the civilian population." Further, it requested

> . . . that Israel cease all acts of encroachment of land, construction of roads and setting up of fences that violate the border, and any attempts to occupy or change the status of Lebanese territory or to impede the return of the effective authority of the Government of Lebanon in sovereign Lebanese territory.

The draft, submitted to a vote on January 13, was defeated by a U.S. veto, 13 to 1 (U.S.) with 1 abstention (U.K.). Affirming continued strong U.S. support for Lebanese independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, Ambassador Walters emphasized the unbalanced nature of the draft resolution:

> Peace cannot come to south Lebanon until the border between Israel and Lebanon is secure. Stability in south Lebanon will always elude us so long as that tortured area is used as the stage for terrorist raids and rocket launchings into Israel. Resolutions on south Lebanon can do no good—no matter how many or how strong—until this body acknowledges the cyclical nature of the violence we seek to end.

In early May an incursion by Israeli forces into an area north of Israel's self-proclaimed "security zone" prompted another Lebanese complaint to the Security Council. The Lebanese Government alleged that Israel blew up and bulldozed dwellings in the village of Maydoun, displacing numerous inhabitants. The non-aligned put forward a draft resolution condemning the "recent invasion" by Israeli forces and repeating the call for the immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanon. The Security Council voted on May 10 and failed to adopt the draft owing to a U.S. veto, 14 to 1 (U.S.). In explanation of vote, Ambassador Walters expressed deep concern over the recent casualties and reaffirmed U.S. support for Security Council resolution 425 (which called for withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon). Citing the need for agreed security arrangements to assure stability in the area, he said the United States could not accept a resolution "that does not acknowledge the well-known fact that hostile acts against Israel are originating in Lebanon." Walters added:

> All those who provide funds and arms to militias and other groups that operate in southern Lebanon, while denying the authority of the central Lebanese Government, must share the responsibility for the continued instability in that area.

On December 9 Israel launched a combined attack against the headquarters of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command (PFLP-

GC) in Damur, on the coast south of Beirut, with numerous casualties resulting. In response to a letter of protest by the Lebanese Government, the non-aligned tabled a draft resolution strongly deploring the Israeli action and requesting that Israel "cease immediately all attacks against Lebanese territory." The United States again exercised its veto, preventing adoption of the draft, 14 to 1 (U.S.). Ambassador Byrne reaffirmed the U.S. commitment "to supporting Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity" but explained that we could not support the draft resolution because it criticized "the actions of one party while ignoring the attacks and reprisals that have originated on the other side of the border."

Abu Jihad Killing

On April 16 Khalil El-Wazir (commonly known as Abu Jihad), a senior official and top military commander in the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), was murdered by gunmen at his residence outside Tunis. While Israel did not officially take responsibility for the act (the Israeli Government neither confirmed nor denied responsibility), it was widely believed that Israeli forces had carried out the mission. In response to a complaint by Tunisia, the non-aligned submitted a draft resolution that strongly condemned "the aggression perpetrated . . . against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Tunisia in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and norms of conduct." Making reference to Israel's October 1985 raid on Tunisian soil, the text noted that the Security Council had at that time "demanded that Israel refrain from perpetrating such acts of aggression or from threatening to do so."

After several days of debate, on April 25 the Security Council adopted resolution 611 by a vote of 14 to 0 with 1 abstention (U.S.). Ambassador Okun explained that the United States "deplores the use of violence from whatever quarter" and, in particular, condemns "acts of political assassination." Okun went on to note the close friendship between the United States and Tunisia as well as the latter's long tradition of political moderation and nonviolence. He added, however, that the United States felt compelled to abstain on the resolution because it "disproportionately places all blame for this latest round in the rising spiral of violence in the Middle East on one event only, while failing to mention other actions that preceded it."

UN Interim Force in Lebanon

The Security Council discussed the peacekeeping operations of the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) on two occasions during 1988 in conjunction with renewal of UNIFIL's 6-month mandate. On January 29 the Council voted to extend the mandate through July 31. On July 29 the Council met again to renew UNIFIL's mandate until January 31, 1989. Both votes were unanimous, 15 (U.S.) to 0. The two resolutions (609 and 617) reiterated the Council's strong support for "the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries" and called on all parties concerned "to cooperate fully with the Force for the full implementation of its mandate," which, if effected, would, *inter alia*, involve extension of UNIFIL's deployment to the area along the Lebanese-Israeli border.

In his July report to the Council on UNIFIL, the Secretary General expressed regret that it had not been possible to make further progress in implementing Security Council resolution 425 (1978), i.e., "withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanese territory, the restoration of international peace and security and the reestablishment of the Lebanese Government's effective authority in the area." Nonetheless, he noted, UNIFIL "continues to play an important role in controlling the level of violence in a very volatile situation."

UN Disengagement Observer Force

The Council also met twice during the year to renew the 6-month mandate of the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) operating on the Golan Heights between Israeli and Syrian forces. Resolution 613, adopted May 29, extended UNDOF's mandate through November 30. The Council voted again on November 30 (Resolution 624) to renew the mandate through May 31, 1989. Both votes were unanimous, 15 (U.S.) to 0. The resolutions called on the concerned parties to implement immediately UN Security Council resolution 338 (1973). In his May and November reports to the Council on UNDOF, the Secretary General noted:

> Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached.

On both occasions the President of the Security Council issued a brief statement indicating that this observation by the Secretary General also reflected the view of the Council.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Israeli Credentials

As in previous years, the 43rd General Assembly witnessed an Arab-sponsored challenge to Israel's credentials. During plenary consideration of the first report of the Credentials Committee on October 18, the Arab group presented a motion that the recommendations of the committee be accepted, except for those regarding the Delegation of Israel. Acting on behalf of the five Nordic countries, the Norweigan representative moved formally under Rule 74 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure that action be deferred on the Arab amendment. (This was the seventh consecutive year that the Nordic group had initiated such action.) The Nordic motion was approved 95 (U.S.) to 41 with 7 abstentions, representing a record margin of victory. Having thus disposed of the challenge to Israeli credentials, the Assembly proceeded to adopt the first report of the Credentials Committee without a vote. (Resolution 43/10 A.)

Situation in the Middle East

The General Assembly debated the annual agenda item the "Situation in the Middle East" in two plenary sessions December 5-6. On December 6 the three draft resolutions submitted under this item were adopted. Each was sponsored by Bangladesh, Indonesia and the United Arab Emirates. The United States voted against two of the resolutions and abstained on one.

The first draft resolution, A/43/L.44, dealt with the occupied territories. Its 15 operative paragraphs differed little from the text adopted the previous year. The resolution reaffirmed that just and lasting peace in the region could not be achieved without "the immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of Israel from the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem." It endorsed the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including "the right to return and the right to self-determination, national independence and the establishment of its independent sovereign state in Palestine." Deploring Israel's failure to comply with earlier resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, the resolution declared Israel's annexation of Jerusalem null and void. It further condemned Israel's policies and practices against the Palestinian people in the territories, including expropriation and establishment of settlements. The text strongly condemned imposition of Israeli law in the Golan Heights. It called on all states to end any military, economic, financial and technological aid to Israel, and specifically condemned "increasing collaboration between Israel and the racist regime of South Africa."

In a new paragraph, the resolution called for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, under UN auspices, with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council and all parties to the conflict, including the PLO as "the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people," on an equal footing. According to the text, this conference would have "full authority" to achieve a solution in accordance with relevant UN resolutions. The resolution called for setting up a preparatory committee of the permanent members to help convene such a conference.

The resolution, 43/54 A, was adopted by a vote of 103 to 18 (U.S.) with 30 abstentions. Many of our allies joined the United States in voting against the measure. The United States requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 10, which mentioned the United States by name and denounced various cooperative agreements between the United States and Israel. The Assembly voted to retain the paragraph by a vote of 71 to 30 (U.S.) with 42 abstentions.

The second draft resolution, A/43/L.45, specifically addressed the Golan Heights. Strongly condemning Israel for its failure to comply with relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, the text declared that Israel's continuing occupation of the Golan constitutes "an act of aggression" under the provisions of the UN Charter and a continuing threat to international peace and security. The resolution determined that "Israel's record, policies and actions confirm that it is not a peace-loving member state." It further called on all member states to suspend all military, economic, financial and technological assistance to Israel and to sever all diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with Israel. This resolution, 43/54 B, was approved by a vote of 83 to 21 (U.S.) with 45 abstentions. Again, many Western countries opposed the resolution.

The third draft, A/43/L.46, concerned the status of Jerusalem. Its operative paragraphs declared Israel's annexation of the city "illegal and therefore null and void" and deplored the transfer of diplomatic missions to Jerusalem by some states in violation of Security Council resolution 378 (1980). The resolution, 43/54 C, was adopted by a vote of 143 to 2 with 7 abstentions (U.S.). Only El Salvador and Israel voted no.

In explanation of vote, Alternate U.S. Representative Montgomery emphasized that for over 40 years the United States has been in the forefront of efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East. He noted that the United States believes the only realistic means of achieving a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict is through direct negotiations between the concerned parties based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338. He expressed U.S. regret that the "empty rhetoric and inflammatory accusations" in the draft resolutions would retard rather than promote this process. Ambassador Montgomery explained that the United States could not support resolutions 43/54 A and 43/54 B because they were "highly objectionable in tone" and contained "unbalanced, harsh condemnation of Israel." He added that 43/54 A "endorses an authoritative international peace conference on the Middle East, a concept we cannot support." Regarding resolution 43/54 C, Montgomery explained that the United States abstained because "we believe that the status of Jerusalem should be determined by means of negotiations among the parties concerned and as part of an overall peace settlement."

Question of Palestine

In response to the U.S. decision to deny PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat a visa to come to New York to address the United Nations, on November 30 the General Assembly adopted resolution 43/48 deploring the decision as a violation of the host country agreement between the United States and the United Nations and urging that the United States reverse the decision. The vote was 151 to 2 (U.S) with 1 abstention (U.K.). Ambassador Okun stated that the United States "does not agree with the tone or substance of the resolution." He continued:

> The denial of a visa to Mr. Arafat is an action fully consistent with the headquarters agreement between the United States and the United Nations and this includes our right to protect our national security, established precedent thereunder and the widely recognized, inherent right of any host state to protect its national security.

When the United States indicated the decision would stand, the Arab group submitted a draft resolution deploring the failure of the United States to respond favorably to the General Assembly's request and deciding to move plenary debate on the annual "Question of Palestine" item from New York to Geneva. This resolution was adopted December 2 by a vote of 154 to 2 (U.S.) with 1 abstention (U.K.). Ambassador Okun explained that, while we did not favor moving the General Assembly debate to Geneva because we believed a change of venue was unnecessary, we would nonetheless not oppose such a move and would be represented if the meeting were held in Geneva. The United States could not accept, however, a resolution that deplored our decision on the visa denial—a decision that we had said was justifiable and taken for compelling reasons.

Reconvening in Geneva December 13–15, the General Assembly heard some 90 speakers, including Yasser Arafat, on the "Question of Palestine." In his statement, Ambassador Walters reaffirmed the basic outlines of U.S. policy toward the Middle East conflict, including its Palestinian dimension. He said that the United States "remains an active, committed partner in the search for a comprehensive settlement achieved through negotiations." He emphasized "there is no substitute for direct negotiations between the parties concerned." Noting that movement toward peace requires difficult choices on all sides, he stated that "the parties need support to bring them together, and the international community can provide that support." Walters urged that the international community support this process of accommodation and reconciliation between Israelis and Palestinians by laying aside "political preferences and expediencies" and instead adopting "a realistic course toward a comprehensive settlement."

The Arab group and non-aligned sponsored five draft resolutions under the "Question of Palestine" item, all of which were adopted. Three were traditional resolutions endorsing the activities of various UN organs that promote the Palestinian cause. The other two were new resolutions concerning an international peace conference on the Middle East and the nomenclature of the PLO observer mission at the United Nations. The United States voted against all five resolutions.

The first draft resolution, A/43/L.50, endorsed the efforts of the General Assembly's Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, a body that the United States has consistently opposed as serving the partisan political aims of the PLO. The Assembly voted 123 to 2 (U.S.) with 20 abstentions to adopt this measure as resolution 43/175 A.

The next draft, A/43/L.51, dealt mainly with the UN Secretariat's Division for Palestinian Rights, another body opposed by the United States on grounds of partisanship toward the PLO. This text, expressing appreciation and support for the Division's work, was adopted (Resolution 43/175 B) by a vote of 123 to 2 (U.S.) with 20 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/43/L.52 called on the Secretariat's Department of Public Information, in cooperation with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to continue its special information program on the Question of Palestine, with particular emphasis on public opinion in Europe and North America. It was adopted by a vote of 127 to 2 (U.S.) with 17 abstentions. (Resolution 43/175 C.)

Draft resolution A/43/L.53 tabled in Geneva called for the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, "with the participation of all parties to the conflict, including the PLO, on an equal footing, and the five Permanent Members of the Security Council." According to the text, this conference would be based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 and "the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, primarily the right to self-determination." The resolution "affirmed" several principles required for the achievement of peace, including withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967 and dismantling of Israeli settlements in these territories. It further noted the "desire and endeavors to place the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, under the supervision of the United Nations for a limited period." This resolution, 43/176, was adopted by a vote of 138 to 2 (U.S.) with 2 abstentions.

The last draft resolution under this item, A/43/L.54, addressed the status of the PLO. Acknowledging the proclamation of the State of Palestine by the Palestine National Council on November 15, 1988, the resolution affirmed "the need to enable the Palestinian people to exercise their sovereignty over their territory occupied since 1967." In addition, it declared that

> . . . the designation "Palestine" should be used in place of the designation "Palestine Liberation Organization" in the UN system, without prejudice to the observer status and functions of the Palestine Liberation Organization within the UN system.

This measure was approved by a vote of 104 to 2 (U.S.) with 36 abstentions. (Resolution 43/177.)

In explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative expressed regret that "the draft resolutions being considered today fail to address the issues in a constructive manner and thus do nothing to advance the prospects for achieving a settlement." Rather, such resolutions "will only make it more difficult to bring the concerned parties together at the negotiating table." He noted that the resolution on convening an international conference, which purported to resolve in advance issues that must be resolved in negotiations, failed to address "the centrality of direct negotiations between the parties." He reiterated U.S. opposition to any conference having the authority to impose a prescribed solution or overturn agreements reached between the parties.

The U.S. Representative said that the United States objected to the resolution on the status of the PLO because, however vague the formulation "Palestine" might be, we could not support "attempts to lend even a degree of purported legitimacy to the self-proclaimed Palestinian state," an entity not recognized by the United States or by the majority of members of the General Assembly. He explained the U.S. view that the Arab-Israeli problem must be solved through negotiations, not by unilateral actions of any party. "Moreover, we see no legal basis to justify recognition of a Palestinian state. This self-declared entity does not satisfy the generally accepted criteria under international law for statehood."

Israeli Practices in the Occupied Territories

On November 3 the General Assembly held a special plenary meeting to consider the "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories." This meeting was held, at the request of the Arab group, in addition to the regularly scheduled debate on this item in the Special Political Committee later in the General Assembly session. During the plenary meeting the non-aligned tabled a draft resolution condemning "Israel's persistent policies and practices violating the human rights of the Palestinian people" in the occupied territories and strongly deploring Israel's continuing disregard of relevant decisions of the Security Council. It further demanded that Israel abide by the provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention. The resolution was approved 130 to 2 (U.S.) with 16 abstentions. (Resolution 43/21.)

Ambassador Okun explained that the United States objected to the resolution because "it is an unbalanced document, condemning one of the parties for its actions without taking into account acts of violence by the other side. The harsh rhetoric in this resolution can only inflame an already embittered situation, making it more difficult to proceed toward a negotiated settlement." Okun emphasized that U.S. opposition to the resolution should not be construed as indifference to the plight of the Palestinian people or the current situation in the territories. He noted that the United States firmly supported the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories and that we had criticized Israeli actions inconsistent with that Convention. U.S. policy is clear, he said: "Ultimately, the situation in the occupied territories can only be resolved in the context of a negotiated settlement—a comprehensive, durable settlement reached through negotiations based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338."

The Special Political Committee took up consideration of the agenda item on Israeli practices November 17–23. As in previous years, seven draft resolutions sponsored by the Arab group were considered. On November 28 the Committee voted to approve all seven, forwarding them to the plenary with a recommendation that they be adopted. The United States voted against three of the resolutions and abstained on the other four. A brief summary of the resolutions follows.

Draft resolution A/43/L.26 strongly condemned a long list of Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, e.g, "ill-treatment and torture of persons under detention," particularly "children and minors," It was approved by a vote of 89 to 2 (U.S.) with 32 abstentions. The United States objected strongly to the resolution's extreme and sweeping condemnation of Israeli practices. Additionally, the United States called for a separate vote on operative paragraph six, which characterized Israel's violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention as "war crimes and an affront to humanity." This paragraph was retained by a vote of 71 to 20 (U.S.) with 29 abstentions.

A/43/L.27 reaffirmed the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied territories, condemned Israel's failure to acknowledge that the Convention so applies, and demanded that Israel accept and comply with its provisions. The vote was 142 to 1 with 4 abstentions (U.S.). Noting it had abstained because the resolution's strident rhetoric was unhelpful, the United States called for a separate vote on operative paragraph one to reiterate our position that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to the occupied territories. (The vote was 122 (U.S.) to 1.)

A/43/L.28 deplored measures taken by Israel designed to change the legal status, geographical nature and demographic composition of the occupied territories, citing in particular the establishment of settlements. The Committee approved this measure by a vote of 119 to 1 with 4 abstentions (U.S.). The United States said its abstention reflected its view that debate over the legalities of Israeli settlements "only diverts attention from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations." At the same time, the United States reaffirmed its opposition to further settlement activity in the territories.

A/43/L.29 deplored Israel's arbitrary detention or imprisonment of Palestinians, and called on Israel "to release all Palestinians and Arabs arbitrarily detained and imprisoned as a result of their resistance against occupation in order to attain self-determination." This resolution was approved 118 to 2 (U.S.) with 2 abstentions. Noting our consistent opposition to the practice of administrative detention, the United States said it voted no because the resolution went too far in its call for the release of all those detained or imprisoned as a result of activities related to resistance against the occupation—a sweeping demand that appeared to condone acts of violence and other criminal conduct.

A/43/L.30 focused on deportations. It strongly deplored Israel's continuing disregard for relevant UN decisions concerning the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which prohibits deportations of protected persons from occupied territory. The resolution demanded that Israel rescind deportation orders previously carried out, facilitate the return of those deported, and desist from future deportations. This measure was approved by a vote of 121 to 1 with 3 abstentions (U.S.). The United States explained that an abstention was warranted because the resolution's harsh polemics provided no realistic means of addressing the problem of deportations. The U.S. Representative reaffirmed our position that deportation of Palestinian residents of the occupied territories is inconsistent with the Fourth Geneva Convention.

A/43/L.31 determined that Israel's decision to extend its laws to the occupied Golan Heights was "null and void and without international legal effect" and demanded that Israel rescind the decision. The resolution also condemned Israel's persistence in "changing the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and legal status" of the Golan. The vote in favor was 118 to 1 with 5 abstentions (U.S.). Despite continuing U.S. support for Security Council resolution 497 (1981) declaring that Israel's decision to impose its laws in the Golan Heights was null and void, the United States abstained on A/43/L.31 because it contained harsh and unbalanced rhetoric. In so doing, the United States reiterated its view that the Golan Heights is occupied Syrian territory, and that the Golan problem must be resolved through negotiations in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 and 338.

Finally, draft resolution A/43/L.32 condemned Israeli policies and practices directed against students and faculty in the territories, "especially the opening of fire on defenseless students, causing many casualties." It further condemned the "systematic Israeli campaign of repression against and closing of" universities, schools and other educational institutions. The resolution was approved by a vote of 116 to 2 (U.S.) with 5 abstentions. The United States opposed this text because it viewed the resolution's sweeping condemnations of Israeli policies and practices concerning students and educational institutions as unjustified and counterproductive.

Speaking in the Special Political Committee prior to the vote on these draft resolutions, U.S. Adviser Cameron Hume affirmed that the United States has a strong interest in the human rights situation in the occupied territories and maintains a serious dialogue with the Israeli Government on these issues. He regretted, however, that the resolutions being considered "make no practical contribution to safeguarding the human rights of the Palestinians" in the territories, nor to "advancing the search for a just and lasting peace in the region." Hume called on members of the Committee to desist from unhelpful rhetoric and instead "to adopt a more constructive approach focusing on the real need for reconciliation and dialogue between the parties."

On December 6 the above seven draft resolutions were considered by the full General Assembly, which adopted them sequentially as resolutions 43/58

A through G. U.S. votes were identical with those made in the Special Political Committee, i.e., negative votes on 43/58 A, D and G; abstentions on 43/58 B, C, E and F.

Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States

On behalf of Arab League cosponsors, Democratic Yemen introduced in plenary on October 17 the traditional resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States. As in the past several years, the United States voted against the text, which was adopted as resolution 43/3 by a vote of 146 to 2 (U.S.). In a statement before the vote, U.S. Alternate Representative Hugh Montgomery explained that the United States was not opposed to the general principle of enhanced cooperation between the United Nations and the Arab League. He said the United States could not support the resolution, however, because its operative paragraph three requested that the Secretary General attempt to implement previous General Assembly resolutions that the United States had opposed as damaging to the prospects for peace and security in the Middle East.

UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

The Special Political Committee annually considers a series of draft resolutions related to the activities of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). UNRWA is mandated by the General Assembly to provide education, health and relief services to Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza. The United States is the largest single contributor to UNRWA; our contributions since UNRWA's inception in 1949 exceed 3 billion dollars.

During the Committee debate on the UNRWA item, 10 draft resolutions similar to those adopted in previous years were submitted by various sponsors. In voting on November 28, all 10 were approved and referred to the plenary with the recommendation that they be adopted. The United States voted in favor of four of the resolutions and voted against the other six. A brief summary of the resolutions follows.

As in previous years, the United States sponsored the first draft resolution, A/43/L.14, on "Assistance to Palestine Refugees." This resolution is submitted annually by the United States as a reaffirmation of our continued commitment to UNRWA. It expressed support for UNRWA programs and urged other governments to contribute generously. The resolution was approved by a vote of 121 (U.S.) to 0 with 1 abstention.

Two draft resolutions sponsored by several Western European states, A/43/L.15, "Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA," and A/43/L.16, "Assistance to Persons Displaced as a Result of the June 1967 and Subsequent Hostilities," were approved by consensus without a vote. These texts also expressed general support for UNRWA's humanitarian efforts.

The remaining draft resolutions were sponsored by the Arab group. A/43/L.17, "Offers by Member States of Grants and Scholarships for Higher Education, Including Vocational Training, for Palestine Refugees," appealed to governments and organizations to contribute generously to educational institutions providing instruction to Palestinian refugees. It was approved by a vote of 123 (U.S.) to 0 with 1 abstention. The United States supported this measure as a "practical approach to meeting the needs of refugees for higher education," with a reservation regarding operative paragraph five concerning a proposed Jerusalem university "Al-Quds," which the United States does not support.

A/43/L.18, "Palestine Refugees in the Palestinian Territory Occupied by Israel since 1967," demanded that Israel "desist from the removal and resettlement of Palestine refugees" and "destruction of their shelters." The Committee voted to approve the measure 121 to 2 (U.S.). In opposing the resolution, the United States noted that it referred to Palestinian refugees' "inalienable right of return" without making reference to the negotiations among the concerned parties that are required to achieve a comprehensive settlement. The United States also indicated it was not opposed in principle to the concept of voluntary relocation of refugees who seek new and better housing.

A/43/L.19, proposing the "Resumption of the Ration Distribution to Palestine Refugees," was approved by a vote of 100 to 20 (U.S.) with 4 abstentions. The United States voted against this proposal because "it attempts to usurp the authority of the UNRWA Commissioner General to make the decision regarding how best to administer UNRWA programs."

A/43/L.20, "The Return of Population and Refugees Displaced Since 1967," reaffirmed the "inalienable right of all displaced inhabitants to return to their homes or former places of residence" in the occupied territories and strongly deplored Israel's refusal to take steps to permit such return. The vote in favor was 99 to 2 (U.S.) with 23 abstentions. The United States again objected to the reference to an "inalienable right of return" without any mention of the direct negotiations that are required to reach a settlement.

A/43/L.21, "Revenues Derived from Palestine Refugee Properties," called for the Secretary General to establish a fund for the receipt of income, on behalf of displaced Arab owners, derived from their property and assets in Israel. The Committee approved this draft by a vote of 97 to 2 (U.S.) with 24 abstentions. The United States explained it voted against the measure because "it seeks to prejudge the question of refugee compensation outside the context of a negotiated settlement."

A/43/L.22 concerned the "Protection of Palestine Refugees." *Inter alia,* it urged the Secretary General, in consultation with the UNRWA Commissioner General, to "continue their efforts in support of the upholding of the safety and security and the legal and human rights" of Palestinian refugees in the occupied territories. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 121 to 2 (U.S.). In the U.S. view, this would clearly exceed UNRWA's mandate. The United States noted the UN Legal Counsel was on record as affirming that Israel, as the occupying power, had the authority and responsibility to maintain security in the territories.

Finally, draft resolution A/43/L.23 called for the establishment of a new "University of Jerusalem 'Al-Quds' for Palestine Refugees." The vote in favor was 122 to 2 (U.S.) with 1 abstention. While affirming its strong support for practical efforts to promote higher educational opportunities for Palestinian refugees, the United States opposed this proposal because it represented an unreasonable and unworkable approach to the problem, and because it was neither practical nor appropriate for the General Assembly to involve itself in such decision-making.

In his statement to the Committee prior to the voting on the above draft resolutions, U.S. Adviser Cameron Hume emphasized our strong support for UNRWA's humanitarian programs. He expressed regret that, as in the past, many of the resolutions submitted were highly politicized and contained sweeping and unbalanced criticism of Israel that we could not support. In the U.S. view, such resolutions "make no practical contribution to UNRWA's objectives and only serve to exacerbate tensions in an already difficult atmosphere in the occupied territories."

The General Assembly considered the 10 UNRWA-related resolutions in plenary session on December 6, adopting them sequentially as resolutions 43/57 A through J. U.S. votes were identical with those made in the Special Political Committee, i.e., yes votes on 43/57 A, B, C and D; no votes on 43/57 E, F, G, H, I and J.

Assistance to the Palestinian People

In the Second Committee, the non-aligned group sponsored a new draft resolution on economic assistance to the Palestinians in the occupied territories. This resolution requested that all states and other donors providing such assistance channel it "to the Palestinian people through their representative, the PLO." It also requested UN funding to hire 20 experts to develop a program of economic and social assistance for the Palestinians. The text condemned Israel's "brutal economic and social policies and practices" against the Palestinian residents of the territories and asked that UN bodies not extend any form of assistance to Israel. On November 4 the Committee voted 90 to 14 (U.S.) with 14 abstentions to approve the resolution and refer it to plenary. The full Assembly adopted the measure as resolution 43/178 on December 20 by a vote of 118 to 14 (U.S.) with 13 abstentions.

Speaking in the Second Committee before the vote, U.S. Special Adviser Harry Cahill emphasized that the United States is indeed concerned with the economic situation of Palestinians in the occupied territories. He pointed out that the U.S. Government is and has been the largest single donor, through bilateral and multilateral channels, of economic assistance to the Palestinian people, including refugees. He expressed regret at the "harsh, offensive, extreme" tone of the resolution, and said the United States objected to the notion that the PLO should be considered the sole channel of assistance to the Palestinians. In sum, he said, rather than helping to alleviate the situation, "this resolution embitters the issue and makes the situation even worse."

Observer Status of National Liberation Movements Recognized by the Organization of African Unity and/or the League of Arab States

Two new draft resolutions were introduced in the Sixth Committee concerning the UN observer status of SWAPO and the PLO. Jordan introduced A/C.6/43/L.10, which extended to SWAPO and the PLO the same rights that member states enjoy with regard to direct circulation, without an intermediary, of their communications as official UN documents throughout the UN system. On November 28 the Committee voted 81 to 2 (U.S.) with 25 abstentions to approve this text and refer it to the plenary. The U.S. Representative Robert Rosenstock said we opposed the measure because it conferred upon groups the United States did not recognize special privileges traditionally reserved to member states, in contravention of existing UN practice. In addition, the United States objected to the lack of an appropriate study by the UN Secretariat on the resolution's likely financial impact.

A/C.6/43/L.24, introduced by Cuba, called upon member states to grant delegations of SWAPO and the PLO to international organizations or conferences the "facilities, privileges and immunities" necessary for the performance of their functions in accordance with the provisions of the 1975 Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character. The Committee approved this measure on November 28 by a vote of 87 to 9 (U.S.) with 14 abstentions. The United States explained it opposed this attempt to enhance the status of observer organizations under the Vienna Convention, which regulates only the representation of states in their relations with international organizations.

The two draft resolutions were adopted by the full Assembly on December 9 as resolutions 43/160 A and B. The votes were 117 to 2 (U.S.) with 31 abstentions on 43/160 A and 124 to 9 (U.S.) with 18 abstentions on 43/160 B.

Conflict Between Iran and Iraq

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

In 1988 the Secretary General and the Security Council remained actively engaged in efforts to end the Iran-Iraq conflict. These efforts ultimately led to a cease-fire on August 20, establishment of a UN peacekeeping force and the initiation of direct talks between the two parties on implementation of Security Council resolution 598 (1987), which provides the basis for a negotiated settlement.

During the early months of the year, the Security Council continued its regular consultations on the urgency of ending the Gulf war. The United States pursued a two-track diplomatic strategy, working within the Council to obtain a follow-on resolution to enforce resolution 598 while supporting the Secretary General's mediation efforts with the parties. With the support of the United Kingdom and France, the United States proposed the imposition of an arms embargo against Iran as the party not in compliance with 598, a mandatory resolution (Iraq, by contrast, had repeatedly stated its acceptance of 598). A draft enforcement resolution was considered informally by Council members but was never tabled for a vote, as a number of Council members, including the Soviet Union, indicated they preferred to give the Secretary General more time to pursue his mediation efforts.

In late February, the war escalated with a new round of missile attacks by both sides against the other's cities, resulting in widespread destruction and numerous civilian casualties. On March 1 the Secretary General issued a statement deploring these attacks, appealing to the parties to exercise restraint, and underlining the "urgent need to bring this ruinous war to a swift end in accordance with Security Council resolution 598." That same day the President of the Security Council made a statement on behalf of the Council echoing and supporting these concerns.

Nonetheless, Iran and Iraq refused to heed these calls for restraint and the "war of the cities" continued. On March 16 the Council President issued another statement strongly deploring the attacks against civilian targets and insisting that the belligerents "immediately cease all such attacks and desist forthwith from all acts that lead to the escalation of the conflict." The President noted further that the recent escalation "demonstrated the need for full and rapid implementation of resolution 598." The parties ultimately agreed to stand down and the missile exchanges ceased shortly thereafter.

The Secretary General held separate talks in New York in early April with Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Larijani and Iraqi Deputy Foreign Minister Zahawi, with little progress. Iran maintained its unwillingness to endorse unambiguously Security Council resolution 598 as the basis for ending the conflict.

On April 14 the *USS Samuel B. Roberts* was struck by an Iranian-laid mine in international waters of the Persian Gulf near Bahrain, injuring several sailors and causing extensive damage. In response to this provocation, the United States on April 18 shelled Iranian oil platforms in the Gulf that had been used for attacks against nonbelligerent shipping. When other Iranian forces attempted to intervene, U.S. vessels and aircraft engaged them and sank or damaged several Iranian naval vessels.

The United States submitted a letter to the President of the Security Council on April 18 stating that, in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter, "U.S forces have exercised their inherent right of self-defense under international law by taking defensive action in response to an attack by the Islamic Republic of Iran." The letter indicated that the "actions taken are necessary and are proportionate to the threat posed by such hostile Iranian actions." It noted further that Iran's recent laying of mines was "but the latest in a series of offensive attacks and provocations Iranian naval forces have taken against neutral shipping in the international waters of the Persian Gulf." The Secretary General subsequently issued a statement expressing his grave concern at recent events in the Gulf and the possibility of further escalation. He reaffirmed the urgency of bringing the Iran-Iraq conflict to a swift end in accordance with Security Council resolution 598.

After the accidental downing by the *USS Vincennes* of Iran Air flight 655 on July 3, Iran lodged a complaint with the Security Council and demanded Council action condemning the United States. Representing the United States in Council debate on July 14, Vice President Bush stressed that the *Vincennes* had acted in justifiable self-defense. He expressed profound U.S. regret over the loss of innocent life and affirmed that, strictly as a humanitarian gesture, the U.S. Government had decided to provide voluntary, *ex gratia* compensation to the families of the victims. Pointing out that this accident was only the latest in a series of tragedies in the Iran-Iraq conflict, Vice President Bush emphasized that the critical issue before the Council was the continuation of that conflict because of "the continuing refusal of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to comply with resolution 598, to negotiate an end to the war with Iraq, and to cease its acts of aggression against neutral shipping in the Persian Gulf." He added:

> We will continue to defend our interests and support our friends, while remaining steadfastly neutral in the war. As long as this conflict continues, we and other Western nations will work to contain the threat to freedom of navigation and peaceful commerce in a waterway that is vital to the economies of the world. Our naval presence is welcomed by peaceful nations. It is a threat to no one. But we will respond firmly if we are threatened.

After several days of debate, the Council voted unanimously (15 (U.S.) to 0) on July 20 to adopt resolution 616. This resolution expressed deep distress at the incident and regret over the loss of life, welcomed ICAO's decision to conduct an investigation, urged all parties to observe international rules and practices concerning the safety of civil aviation, and stressed the need for full and rapid implementation of resolution 598 to end the conflict. In the U.S. explanation of vote, Ambassador Walters reiterated U.S. regret over the loss of life and said that the United States supported the resolution because it put events in proper perspective, i.e., as "an urgent reminder to the international community that we cannot permit the senseless conflict in the Gulf to continue." Walters affirmed that "working with our allies, we will remain steadfast in our efforts to end the Gulf war while protecting our vital interests in the region."

In a July 18 letter to the Secretary General, Iranian President Khamenei unexpectedly announced Iran's formal acceptance of resolution 598. The United States issued a statement welcoming this as a "major breakthrough" and noting that "it opens the way for end of an 8-year tragic war and restoration of stability in a troubled region of the world." The Secretary General quickly dispatched a technical team to the region to discuss cease-fire arrangements with the parties. Based on these findings, he issued a report in which he proposed establishment of an unarmed UN observer group to monitor the cease-fire and facilitate implementation of the other provisions of resolution 598.

On August 9 the Security Council voted unanimously (15 (U.S.) to 0) to adopt resolution 619 creating the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG). The Secretary General selected Yugoslavian General Slavko Jovic to command the 350-man force, to which 24 countries agreed to contribute military personnel. (It was agreed that the permanent members of the Security Council, including the United States, would not be among the troop contributors.) This force was in place by August 20, when a comprehensive cease-fire went into effect all along the front. The U.S. Government provided extensive airlift support for UNIIMOG as well as miscellaneous equipment and maps.

Iranian and Iraqi Delegations, headed by the respective Foreign Ministers, met in Geneva on August 25 for direct talks on implementation of resolution 598. The opening sessions were chaired by the Secretary General, who subsequently named Jan Eliasson, Sweden's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, as his Special Representative to conduct the negotiations. This first round adjourned September 13; subsequent ministerial-level meetings were held in New York on October 1 and in Geneva beginning October 31. With the parties deadlocked over several key preliminary issues, the talks were recessed November 11 with agreement to resume early in 1989. Iran and Iraq agreed in November to repatriate a limited number of sick and wounded prisoners of war, but this exchange was suspended before completion because of differences over how many POWs qualified.

On September 28 the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the five permanent members of the Security Council met with the Secretary General in New York to exchange views on a range of major international issues. In a statement released at the conclusion of the meeting, the five ministers "reiterated their complete support for the Secretary General's endeavors and their determination to work in cooperation with him to ensure that the resolution (598) be fully implemented as an integral whole."

At year's end, the cease-fire was holding with only minor violations reported. Iraqi forces continued to occupy Iranian territory, and an estimated 100,000 POWs (70,000 Iraqis and 30,000 Iranians) remained in captivity.

Chemical Weapons

Responding to evidence of renewed use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war, the Security Council adopted two resolutions in 1988 condemning the use of such weapons in contravention of international law.

On the basis of several complaints by Iran alleging extensive use of chemical weapons by Iraq at Halabja during an Iranian offensive in March, the Secretary General announced his decision on March 25 to dispatch a team including a medical specialist to Iran to investigate the allegations. At Iraq's request, this team also visited Iraq to investigate Iraqi claims of Iranian use of chemical weapons. The Secretary General's report, issued April 25, concluded that patients on both sides (including civilians from Halabja) had suffered from attacks by chemical weapons, but made no determination of responsibility for these attacks.

Having considered the Secretary General's report, the Security Council voted unanimously (15 (U.S.) to 0) on May 9 to adopt resolution 612, sponsored by the Federal Republic of Germany. This resolution affirmed the "urgent necessity of strict observance" of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 (the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare) and condemned "vigorously the continued use of chemical weapons in the conflict between Iran and Iraq contrary to the obligations under the Geneva Protocol." The Council said it expected both sides to refrain from future use of chemical weapons and called on all states "to continue to apply or to establish strict control of the export to the parties to the conflict or chemical products serving for the production of chemical weapons."

Immediately after the vote, the United States issued a strong statement stressing our support for the Council's action, condemning illegal use of chemical weapons by both Iran and Iraq, and calling for strict international controls on exports of chemical weapons precursors to both parties. Additionally, the statement said:

> It is imperative to act to prevent further erosion of existing international constraints on chemical weapons use. We reiterate our appeal to both sides to cease use of chemical weapons and to abide by the terms of customary and conventional international law, including the Geneva Protocol to which they both subscribe.

In May Iran charged that Iraq had again used chemical weapons against a number of Iranian villages. After conferring with the Security Council, the Secretary General announced in June the dispatch of another technical mission to Iran to investigate the allegations. At Iraqi request, this team also visited Baghdad to investigate Iraqi claims that Iran had recently used chemical weapons against Iraqi forces. Based on the team's findings, the Secretary General issued two reports on July 20 and 25. The report on the visit to Iran included this statement by the team of experts: "On the basis of evidence gathered during the present mission, and in spite of repeated appeals by the United Nations, chemical weapons continue to be used on an intensive scale against Iranian forces." The report stated further that "it can be concluded that bombs similar to those used in 1984, 1986 and 1987 have again been used against Iranian forces on Iranian territory, indicating their repeated utilization by Iraqi forces." The report on the visit to Iraq confirmed that Iraqi soldiers had suffered injuries caused by chemical agents but did not determine responsibility, noting only that certain agents were found in "fragments of mortar grenades found after an alleged Iranian attack" and that a blister agent was identified in grenade crates "said to have been captured from Iranian forces."

A subsequent report, released by the Secretary General on August 19, was based on an investigation by three specialists of alleged Iraqi use of chemical weapons in an August 2 attack against the Iranian town of Oshnaviyeh. The experts confirmed the presence of mustard gas in the area of the attack, adding "it can be concluded that bombs similar to those found in 1984, 1986, 1987 and 1988 have been used against Iranian civilians, indicating their utilization during an Iraqi air attack on Oshnaviyeh."

In response to these reports, on August 26 the Security Council voted unanimously (15 (U.S.) to 0) to adopt a resolution cosponsored by the United Kingdom, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Italy. Resolution 620 expressed the Council's deep dismay at the evidence of continued use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq conflict and condemned resolutely such use in violation of the Geneva Protocol and in defiance of resolution 612. It encouraged the Secretary General to promptly carry out investigations in response to allegations of illegal use of chemical weapons, and called on all states to apply, establish or strengthen strict export controls on chemical products used in the production of chemical weapons. The resolution stated further that, in case of any future use of chemical weapons in violation of international law, the Council would consider immediately "appropriate and effective measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

In September reports emerged of extensive use of chemical weapons by Iraq against its Kurdish population during recent internal fighting against Kurdish rebels. Many of the Kurds fled across the border to Turkey. After an evaluation of available evidence, the United States announced it was convinced that Iraq had used chemical weapons in its military campaign against Kurdish guerrillas, and condemned this use. The United States and several of our allies urged that the Secretary General undertake a UN investigation of the charges. The Iraqi and Turkish Governments declined to accept such a mission, however, and as a result no UN investigation was conducted.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly carried over from previous years an agenda item on the "Consequences of the Prolongation of the Armed Conflict between Iran and Iraq." A resolution was adopted under this item in its first year of introduction (1982) by the 37th General Assembly, but no action has been taken in subsequent years. The 43rd General Assembly again decided not to take action, retaining the item on the agenda for the next session.

In August the 42nd General Assembly met in resumed session to appropriate funds for the newly established UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG). On August 17 the Assembly adopted, without a vote, a financing resolution providing funding of $35.7 million for the first 3 months of UNIIMOG's operations. The 43rd General Assembly adopted on December 21, also without a vote, a subsequent resolution (43/230) that appropriated an additional $18.3 million for UNIIMOG's first mandate period (August 9, 1988 through February 8, 1989). The resolution also authorized expenditure of $95.8 million for the 12-month period beginning February 9, 1989, subject to Security Council renewal of UNIIMOG's mandate.

Afghanistan

The atmosphere on Afghanistan at the 43rd General Assembly was fundamentally altered with the signing of the Geneva Accords on April 14, 1988. The Accords stipulated an agreed timetable for total Soviet withdrawal and, as a result, consensus replaced confrontation. The Soviets sought consensus to avoid a divisive debate and another humiliating defeat (the 42nd General Assembly's record vote was 123 (U.S.) to 19 with 11 abstentions). They agreed to Pakistan's draft as a basis for a consensus resolution (43/20), adopted November 3 without debate.

The resolution, entitled "The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security," retained key elements from resolutions of earlier years. Expressing grave concern "at the situation in Afghanistan, which results from the violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of the recognized norms of inter-State conduct," the resolution:

> (1) Welcomes the conclusion at Geneva, on 14 April 1988, of the agreements on the Settlement of the Situation Relating to Afghanistan under UN auspices, which constitute an important step towards a comprehensive political solution of the Afghanistan problem;
>
> (2) Expresses its deep appreciation to the Secretary General and his Personal Representative for their constant efforts to achieve a political solution of the Afghanistan

problem; restoration of an independent and non-aligned Afghanistan;

(3) Calls for the scrupulous respect for and faithful implementation of the Geneva Agreements by all parties concerned who should faithfully abide by their letter and spirit;

(4) Notes the continuing process of withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and expressed its expectation that the withdrawal will be completed in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Geneva Agreements;

(5) Reiterates the preservation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-aligned character of Afghanistan is essential for a peaceful solution of the Afghanistan problem;

(6) Reaffirms the right of the Afghan people to determine their own form of government and to choose their economic, political and social system free from outside intervention, subversion, coercion or constraint of any kind whatsoever;

(7) Calls upon all parties concerned to work for the urgent achievement of a comprehensive political solution and the creation of the necessary conditions of peace and normalcy that would enable the Afghan refugees to return voluntarily to their homeland in safety and honor;

(8) Emphasizes the need for an intra-Afghan dialogue for the establishment of a broad-based government to ensure the broadest support and immediate participation of all the segments of the Afghan people;

(9) Requests the Secretary General and his Personal Representative to encourage and facilitate the early realization of a comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Agreements and of the present resolution;

(10) Renews its appeal to all states and national and international organizations to continue to extend humanitarian relief assistance with a view to alleviating the hardship of the refugees, in coordination with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees;

(11) Welcomes the appointment of a Special Coordinator for channeling economic and humanitarian assistance to the people of Afghanistan;

(12) Calls upon all states to provide adequate financial and material resources to the Special Coordinator for the purposes of achieving the speedy repatriation and rehabilitation of the Afghan refugees as well as for the economic and social reconstruction of the country;

(13) Requests the Secretary General to keep member states and the Security Council informed of progress towards the implementation of the present resolution and to submit to the General Assembly at the 44th session a report on the situation in Afghanistan, on progress achieved in the implementation of the Geneva Agreements and the political settlement relating to Afghanistan; and

(14) Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its 44th session the item entitled "The situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security."

Ambassador Walters made a statement to the press outside the Assembly chambers immediately following the adoption of the resolution by consensus in which he commented on U.S. policy objectives:

> I consider this resolution one more indication of the success of our policy in this area. It is also a tribute to the brave Afghan freedom fighters whose courage has helped create, once again the hope of a free and independent Afghanistan.

Ambassador Walters also strongly condemned continued Soviet military actions in the country:

> Unfortunately, Soviet actions in Afghanistan in recent days—the introduction of high performance aircraft and their use in offensive operations against the Mujahedin and the introduction of other advanced weaponry into Afghanistan—are not consistent with the intent and words of the resolution adopted here.
>
> These actions will increase the suffering of the Afghan people but will not alter the outcome. They are to be condemned. I consider them acts of desperation. The world

expects the Soviets to conform their actions in Afghanistan to the resolution to which they and the entire international community have just adhered.

The United States, while viewing the Geneva Accords as an important "first step," has repeatedly pointed out that the Accords do not stipulate measures for achieving a political settlement of the ongoing Afghan conflict. The U.S. view is that Afghanistan's political future is a question for the Afghan people to resolve, free from outside interference.

The Geneva Accords stipulated the creation of a small UN force to monitor Soviet withdrawal and general compliance with the agreement. The UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) was established in May 1988. UNGOMAP consists of 51 military officers and a civilian support staff of about 30. There are 10 countries contributing troops (Austria, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Ireland, Nepal, Poland and Sweden). UNGOMAP's commander is Finnish Major General Helminen. The Secretary General issued a statement on August 16, noting that UNGOMAP had reported to him that the first phase of "the withdrawal of foreign troops was proceeding in compliance with the Geneva Accords."

UNGOMAP's status was "provisionally approved" in an exchange of letters between the Secretary General and the Security Council President in April 1988. A formal Security Council resolution, "regularizing" UNGOMAP's status, without expanding the scope of its mission, was adopted by consensus in October. UNGOMAP's period of deployment is for up to 20 months. The Secretary General, however, noted last April that he expected the bulk of UNGOMAP forces "would not need to be deployed for a period longer than 10 months," the period for completion of Soviet withdrawal (February 15, 1989). We support the idea of downscaling UNGOMAP in the aftermath of Soviet withdrawal, scheduled for February 15, 1989.

UNGOMAP costs are funded from the UN regular budget. The 43rd General Assembly approved gross expenditures of $13,402,500 for UNGOMAP in the 1988–1989 UN program budget. The expenditure level was offset, in part, by a $5 million voluntary contribution from Japan which, in net terms, would reduce the 1988–1989 approved UNGOMAP expenditures to $8,402,500.

Cambodia

CREDENTIALS AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The United Nations began dealing with the Cambodia issue in the wake of Vietnam's invasion of that country in 1978. This year represented the sixth consecutive year in which Hanoi chose not to challenge the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea (now represented by the the coalition government of the Cambodian resistance) in the UN General Assembly. In earlier General Assemblies, Vietnam's challenge to the Democratic Kampuchea seat was overwhelmingly defeated in the plenary. The report of the Credentials Committee, which accepted Democratic Kampuchea's credentials among others, was adopted in the General Assembly by consensus on October 18. (Resolution 43/10 A.)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Since the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia in December 1978 the General Assembly has passed 10 times by overwhelming and increasing majorities resolutions calling for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cambodia, Cambodian self-determination and aid to Khmer refugees. The resolution (43/19) was introduced at the 43rd General Assembly, as it has been every year, by members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) comprising Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. The resolution, which had a record 64 cosponsors, was adopted on November 3 by a vote of 122 (U.S.) to 19, with 13 abstentions. This represented 5 more affirmative votes than the 117 received for a similar resolution (42/3) in 1987.

The resolution, entitled "The Situation in Kampuchea (Cambodia)," endorsed the full implementation of the past eight resolutions on the subject and called for

> . . . the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea under effective international supervision and control, the creation of an interim administering authority, the promotion of national reconciliation among all Kampucheans under the leadership of Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, the nonreturn to the universally condemned policies and practices of a recent past, the restoration and preservation of the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and neutral and non-aligned status of Kampuchea, the reaffirmation of the right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own destiny, and the commitment by all states to noninterference and nonintervention in the internal affairs of Kampuchea, with effective guarantees, as the principal components of any just and lasting resolution of the Kampuchean problem.

The resolution also took note, "with appreciation," of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea on its activities in 1987–1988 and requested "that the committee continue its work, pending the reconvening of the conference."

Speaking for the United States on November 3, Ambassador Vernon A. Walters presented the U.S. policy objectives for Cambodia:

> The resolution is in harmony with my own government's twin goals for Cambodia: first, immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of Vietnam's forces in Cambodia and, second, a nonreturn to power of Pol Pot and those closely associated with him in the Khmer Rouge.

Ambassador Walters concluded his speech with an appeal to the international community to take the necessary actions to ensure that Cambodia is free of domination by either the Vietnamese or the Khmer Rouge:

The Cambodian people have suffered long enough. They deserve the right to determine their own form of government, free from outside interference. They are entitled to our best effort. The international community, which has come to equate the name Cambodia with tragedy, should do everything possible to ensure that Cambodia becomes once again a gentle land, independent and free from conflict.

South African Policies of Apartheid and Related Issues

SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

In 1988 the UN Security Council met nine times to consider questions related to South Africa. It adopted three resolutions on the subject, and one other resolution failed of adoption because of a negative vote by a permanent member of the Security Council. All four resolutions were sponsored by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) members of the Security Council: Algeria, Argentina, Nepal, Senegal, Yugoslavia and Zambia. In addition, the Council met once in formal consultation of the whole which resulted in a Presidential statement.

Situation in South Africa

On March 3, on behalf of the African Group in the United Nations, Zambia requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation inside South Africa and in the region resulting from South Africa's internal repression of regime opponents, specifically the measures adopted on February 24 outlawing the activities of a variety of individuals and organizations who had been working against the system of apartheid. During five sessions of debate over the next 5 days, 26 states spoke, as well as representatives of the UN Council for Namibia and the UN's Special Committee against Apartheid. All speakers condemned the South African government's apartheid policies, and most of the speakers called for mandatory sanctions against South Africa as a means of exerting pressure on the government. On the first day of the debate, the Representative of South Africa made a particularly vigorous statement in defense of his government's policies, which many members of the Council and other states present during the debate found excessive. The U.S. Representative later characterized the South African statement as "purposely provocative and inflammatory."

The resolution presented by the NAM members of the Council proposed, among other measures, the imposition of selective mandatory sanctions. Despite efforts to negotiate a text which all Council members could support, the draft sponsors were unwilling to reach a compromise. On March 8 the draft text was brought to vote.

Speaking in explanation of the U.S. position before the vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Herbert S. Okun, stressed the U.S. view that "the system of apartheid in South Africa must be eradicated. Its continued existence 43 years after the signing of the UN Charter constantly reminds us that the ideal of racial equality embodied in the Charter has not yet been realized," he added. He noted that recent events within South Africa indicated the country's rulers were not interested in racial equality, but only in "the survival of their medieval system of apartheid." The people and organizations whose activities had been outlawed were precisely those working for a peaceful transition to a more democratic, nonracial system. The government's actions seemed to indicate it would not tolerate peaceful, non-violent opposition to apartheid, and the United States feared the decision had "dealt a severe blow to efforts to move South Africa peacefully to a society which practices racial equality . . . (and was) a giant step backwards." Ambassador Okun cited Secretary of State Shultz' earlier statement that the United States favors "a new constitutional order for a united South Africa establishing equal political, economic and social rights for all South Africans without regard to race, language, national origin or religion." While it might still be possible to achieve the goals of personal and human rights which this represents, time was running out, Ambassador Okun warned.

Ambassador Okun noted that the U.S. Delegation had been ready to work with other delegations to negotiate a resolution which could have won unanimous support and thereby sent a clearer message to the South African Government. Unfortunately, the drafters of the resolution chose to respond to the South African position by proposing a draft resolution the U.S. Government could not accept, since it contained a call for mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Ambassador Okun concluded that it was ironic that the draft resolution "would further isolate South Africa and would therefore only serve the interests of those in that country who seek to perpetuate apartheid."

The NAM draft was voted upon and the results were 10 in favor, 2 against (U.S., U.K.) and 3 abstentions (France, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan). The resolution was not adopted owing to the negative vote (veto) by two Permanent Members of the Security Council.

Eight days later, on March 16, the Council met again for one session, in response to a request by Zambia, to consider another aspect of the security situation in South Africa. Before the Council was the issue of six persons sentenced to death after conviction of complicity in an outbreak of violence leading to deaths in the South African township of Sharpeville. Placed before the Council by the six NAM members was a draft resolution which called upon the South African government to commute the death sentences of the Sharpeville Six, in order to avert more serious violence in the region. The resolution was adopted unanimously, without debate. (Resolution 610.)

The Council met again on the same subject 3 months later, on June 17, when it again had before it a letter from the permanent representative of Zambia on the Sharpeville Six. A draft resolution presented by the six NAM members again called upon the South African government to grant clemency in the case of the Sharpeville Six. The resolution was adopted unanimously, without debate. (Resolution 615.)

On June 24 the Council met in consultations of the whole to consider a complaint by Botswana concerning a raid by South African forces into Botswanan territory resulting in the loss of life. After consultations, the Council authorized the President to issue a statement in its behalf. The statement deplored the violence resulting from the cross-border actions by the Government of South Africa and called upon the South African authorities to cease such raids immediately.

At its 2,830th meeting, on November 30, the Council met again to consider the situation inside South Africa. Zambia had again requested the meeting, which considered a draft resolution presented by the NAM members of the Council. The issue was the sentence passed by the South African authorities against Mr. Paul Thabo Setlaba, who had been convicted of participating as an accessory in a violent demonstration which led to the loss of life.

Speaking before the vote, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Robert Immerman, said the United States "remains unalterably opposed to the system of apartheid," and stressed there must not be any violations of the human rights of South African citizens. He noted, however, that Mr. Setlaba "had admitted he was a party to the act for which he was convicted." While the United States cannot condone violence by any part, it therefore intended to abstain on the resolution before the Council.

The vote was 13 to 0, with 2 abstentions (U.S., U.K.). (Resolution 623.)

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Policies of Apartheid

The General Assembly considered the question of "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa" at 9 meetings between November 28 and December 5, with voting on 11 resolutions taking place the last day of debate. While three of the resolutions were new, eight of them were virtually identical to those considered by the General Assembly in previous years. As in the past, the Assembly dealt with the issue in plenary, without prior reference to a main committee. The Assembly had before it: the annual report of the Special Committee Against Apartheid*; the Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa**; three reports of the Secretary General (on the UN Trust Fund for

---

*The Special Committee Against Apartheid was established in 1962 as the "Special Committee on the Policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa." The 18 members in 1988 were: Algeria, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago and Ukrainian S.S.R. No Western members sit on the Committee.

**The Intergovernmental Group, established on the basis of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F of November 10, consists of representatives of the following 11 countries: Algeria, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Kuwait, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Ukrainian S.S.R. and the United Republic of Tanzania.

South Africa, the Status of the International Convention Against Apartheid in Sports and Concerted International Action for the Elimination of Apartheid); and the report of the Special Political Committee. In his capacity as chairman of the Special Committee Against Apartheid, the Permanent Representative of Nigeria opened the debate on November 28. He argued that during the previous year South Africa had increased both domestic repression and aggression against its neighbors, and that limited, government-initiated reform had failed to co-opt the country's black majority. He also charged that "a few Western countries" had become "an obstacle to effective pressure" against South Africa because of their opposition to comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

During the 5-day debate 85 speakers took part, not counting rights of reply and explanations of vote. Condemnation of South Africa's policy of apartheid and its repression of domestic opposition was universal. Nearly all speakers also supported comprehensive mandatory sanctions, with some warning the members of the Security Council that failure to adopt such measures would increase the likelihood of long-term violence in South Africa. Explicit criticism of the United States was relatively rare, but many delegations faulted "major Western powers" or "Permanent Members of the Security Council" for their opposition to mandatory sanctions. The representative of the African National Congress (ANC), the major South African anti-government insurgent movement, praised the passage of the U.S. Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act and commended "the American public's relentless efforts against apartheid." The representative of the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), a smaller anti-government movement, addressed the General Assembly along similar lines.

In her explanation of vote on the series of resolutions the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne, emphasized that "the people and Government of the United States stand second to none in their total rejection of racism and apartheid." U.S. policy has been and will continue to be "to promote a peaceful transition to non-racial democracy and justice for all in South Africa." She noted that "a solution to South Africa's problems cannot be imposed from outside, by any one nation or by the entire United Nations. Only South Africans themselves can develop such a solution."

While the United States opposes apartheid, the proposed resolutions contained language and prescriptions with which the United States must again disagree, including a call for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, which "simply will not work." Likewise, the United States could not accept language that legitimized armed conflict, which is "wholly contrary to the dedicated search for peaceful resolution of the world's problems . . . which members of this body profess to espouse," she noted, adding "a call to violence only increases the chance of greater violence." She also referred to the continued decline in explicit critical references to the United States, and she pointed out another instance where a resolution singled out one country "for actions which many have committed, including some of those who protest most loudly." In joining the consensus on the call for a special session of the General Assembly on apartheid, the United States went on record with the hope that the session will be brief and to the point, and the understanding that the regular session of the General Assembly would not hold further discussion on the issue during its 44th session.

The first resolution, entitled "International Solidarity with the Liberation Struggle in South Africa," was introduced by Nigeria and had 49 other sponsors. As in previous years, it reaffirmed the legitimacy of armed struggle, condemned the "policy and practices of apartheid and in particular the execution of patriots and captured freedom fighters," and demands an end to the state of emergency in South Africa as well as the unconditional release of all political prisoners and detainees. The resolution added a call for withdrawal of troops from black townships and the end to military and para-military activities against neighboring countries. The resolution called upon states to increase all forms of necessary assistance to "the people of South Africa and their national liberation movements," appealed for greater financial and material aid to the states bordering South Africa, and continued the authorization of funds from the UN's regular budget for the maintenance of offices in New York by the two principal South African insurgent movements (ANC and PAC). The United States voted against this resolution because of its reaffirmation of the legitimacy of armed struggle. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 131 to 3 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "Military Collaboration with South Africa," was introduced by Ghana, joined by 46 other sponsors. A new resolution, it recalled previous decisions by the General Assembly and the Security Council on the arms embargo against South Africa and urged "those states which directly or indirectly infringe the arms embargo and continue to collaborate with South Africa" to terminate such acts. It also urged the Security Council to "consider immediate steps to ensure the scrupulous and full implementation of the arms embargo." Noting that "the United States implemented an arms embargo against South Africa long before the United Nations," Ambassador Byrne added that "the sad fact is, however, that the arms embargo has been only partially effective . . . South Africa has nevertheless continued to import arms clandestinely" and had developed its own significant arms industry. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 123 to 2 (U.S.), with 29 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 B.)

The third resolution, entitled "Comprehensive and Mandatory Sanctions Against the Racist Regime of South Africa," was introduced by Ghana and had 37 cosponsors. As in last year's resolution, it reaffirmed that apartheid is both a "crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security," decided that "the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would be the most appropriate, effective and peaceful means to bring apartheid to an end," and urgently requested the Security Council to take action to implement such sanctions. It also urged the Security Council to strengthen the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa initially imposed in 1977.

This resolution also contained the only explicit reference to the United States in the eight resolutions on apartheid, in operative paragraph six. It appealed to the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States "to cooperate in the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions by the international community . . . as a means for achieving peaceful change" in South Africa. The U.S. Delegation requested a separate vote on this paragraph, in an effort to have the reference removed. The General Assembly decided, however, to retain the reference by a vote of 82 to 27 (U.S.), with 31 abstentions. In addition, a separate, recorded vote was requested by the Delegation of Japan on a phrase in operative paragraph three of the resolution, which asserted that Japan "recently emerged as the most important trading partner of South Africa." The vote was 50 to 41 (U.S.) with 43 abstentions, and the paragraph was retained.

The United States voted against the resolution as a whole because of its call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 123 to 12 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 C.)

The fourth resolution, entitled "Imposition, Co-ordination and Strict Monitoring of Measures against South Africa," was introduced by Nigeria and had 37 other sponsors. It urged "all states that have not yet done so, pending the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, to adopt legislative and/or comparable measures to impose effective sanctions against South Africa." The resolution again specified embargoes on the supply of products that can be used by the South Africa military or nuclear industry, as well as an embargo on the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa. It also called for a ban on the importation of coal, gold, strategic minerals and agricultural products from South Africa and Namibia, the withdrawal of transnational corporations from both those countries, prevention of citizens from other countries from serving in South African armed forces or other sensitive sectors and the adoption of measures to ensure the effectiveness of the sports and cultural boycotts against South Africa. The United States again voted against this resolution because of its advocacy of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. As Ambassador Byrne stated in her explanation of vote, "we oppose imposition by the United Nations of such sanctions, as members know, because we believe that sweeping, worldwide sanctions simply will not work." This resolution was adopted by a vote of 123 to 2 (U.S.), with 29 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 D.)

The fifth resolution, entitled "Relations Between South Africa and Israel," was introduced by Sudan and had 33 other cosponsors. It called on Israel "to abide by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council by terminating forthwith all forms of military, nuclear, intelligence, economic and other collaboration" with South Africa. It also requested the

Special Committee Against Apartheid to continue to monitor relations between South Africa and Israel and to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate. The United States voted against the resolution because, in the words of Ambassador Byrne, it "criticizes a single country for actions which many have committed, including some of those who protest most loudly." This resolution was adopted by a vote of 106 to 23 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 E.)

The sixth resolution, entitled "Program of Work of the Special Committee Against Apartheid," was introduced by Nigeria, joined by 48 other sponsors. Consistent with previous resolutions, it commended the work of the Special Committee, took note of the Committee's annual report and endorsed the recommendations therein, and made a special allocation to the Special Committee from the UN regular budget for special projects to be decided by the Committee, this year of $400,000. It also requested governments and other organizations to provide financial assistance both to the special projects of the Committee and to the Trust Fund for Publicity Against Apartheid. Lastly, the resolution appealed to governments, organizations and individuals to cooperate with the Center Against Apartheid and the UN Department of Public Information in disseminating information on the "deteriorating situation in South Africa." The United States voted against this resolution because, as noted by Ambassador Byrne, it was one of those "which imply increased expenses without regard to contrary earlier decisions by this body and its subsidiary committees." This resolution passed by a vote of 144 to 1 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. (Resolution 42/50 F.)

The seventh resolution was proposed by Nigeria and had 38 cosponsors. A new resolution, it called for a "Special Session of the General Assembly on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa." In her explanation of the U.S. position, Ambassador Byrne noted the U.S. belief that "proven, positive results on apartheid will be best assured through patient negotiations, as has been the case recently in . . . Namibia, rather than rhetorical flourishes in sterile debates." Trusting that the special session will be "brief and to the point," Ambassador Byrne noted the United States assumes the Assembly will not hold further discussions on the issue during its 44th regular session. The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/50 G.)

The eighth resolution, entitled "Dissemination of Information against the Policies of Apartheid of the Regime of Racist South Africa," was introduced by Zaire with 35 cosponsors. It urged the Secretary General to "intensify, increase and expand" radio broadcasts directed at South Africa, and commensurately to increase the UN staff engaged in production of these programs. It also appealed to governments, nongovernmental organizations and agencies to ensure the widest possible dissemination of such programs and expressed appreciation to those member states and international organizations which have done so in the past. The United States voted against the resolution.

Ambassador Byrne noted the resolution "implied increased expenses without regard to contrary earlier decisions by this body and its subsidiary committees." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 132 to 1 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 H.)

The ninth resolution, entitled "UN Trust Fund for South Africa," was introduced by Sweden and had 40 sponsors. Similar to a comparable resolution the previous year, it expressed appreciation to governments, organizations and individuals who have contributed to the Trust Fund and to voluntary agencies assisting the victims of apartheid. The resolution again appealed for increased contributions to both the Trust Fund and those voluntary agencies, and commended the Secretary General and the trustees of the Fund for their promotion of assistance to persons persecuted under apartheid and to refugees from South Africa. As in the past, the United States joined consensus on this resolution, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/50 I.)

The 10th resolution, entitled "Oil Embargo Against South Africa," was introduced by Kuwait, with 22 cosponsors. Taking note of the report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa the resolution as in the past urged the Security Council "to take action without further delay to impose a mandatory embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa as well as the supply of equipment and technology to, financing of and investment in its oil industry and coal liquefaction projects." The resolution went on to request all states concerned, pending a decision by the Security Council, to adopt effective oil embargo measures or legislation against South Africa and to cooperate with the Intergovernmental Group in the implementation of the present resolution. The United States voted against this resolution because of the mandatory nature of the embargo it prescribed. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 138 to 2 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 J.)

The 11th and final resolution, entitled "Concerted International Action for the Elimination of Apartheid," was introduced by Sweden and had 30 other sponsors. The resolution strongly condemned the policy of apartheid and the actions of the South African government against opposition groups and individuals. It further condemned the "overt and covert aggressive actions" of South Africa against neighboring states. The resolution demanded that the South African authorities take a series of steps, including the release of all political prisoners, the lifting of the state of emergency and the initiation of a political dialogue "with genuine leaders of the majority population with a view to eradicating apartheid without delay and establishing a representative government."

The resolution went on to urge the Security Council "to consider without delay the adoption of effective mandatory sanctions against South Africa" and also to take steps for the strict implementation of the mandatory arms embargo instituted in 1977. It appealed to all states, pending the imposition of mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, to consider enacting through national legislative or executive means a variety of selective sanctions against South Africa. It also appealed to states and organizations to increase assistance to the countries neighboring South Africa, as well as to the victims of apartheid, liberation movements recognized by the OAU, and all those struggling for a "nonracial, democratic society in South Africa." In addition, the resolution appealed to governments and organizations to abide by the academic, cultural, scientific and sports boycotts against South Africa. It also reaffirmed the "legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for the total eradication of apartheid and for the establishment of a non-racial, democratic society." The United States, once again, opposed this resolution because of its call for mandatory sanctions. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 149 to 2 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. (Resolution 43/50 K.)

Other African Questions

COMORIAN ISLAND OF MAYOTTE

The question of the Comorian island of Mayotte has been included in the General Assembly's agenda since 1976. The dispute between France and the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros centers on the status of the Island of Mayotte, whose largely Christian population in referenda in 1974 and 1976 indicated a preference to remain a part of France rather than associate with the other, predominantly Muslim, Comoros Islands which gained independence in 1975.

In the 43rd General Assembly the Mayotte question was considered in plenary on October 26. Following speeches by six delegations, including the Comoros and France, the Assembly voted on a draft resolution that was identical to the one adopted the year before. It reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Comoros over Mayotte, called for the "translation into practice" of the wish expressed by the President of France to seek a just solution, and urged France to accelerate the process of negotiations with a view to ensuring the return of Mayotte to the Comoros. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 127 to 1, with 25 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 43/14.)

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

The African group in the United Nations annually introduces a draft resolution in the General Assembly that calls for cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU). After several delays for consultations among members and for a review of any financial implications by the Fifth Committee, Tanzania, as chairman of the African Group, tabled the draft at the 43rd General Assembly. The draft closely resembled the resolution on the OAU adopted by consensus the year before.

As in previous years, the draft requested the Secretary General to strengthen cooperation with the OAU, called on UN agencies to ensure the equitable representation of Africans on their staffs, expressed appreciation to the United Nations for its economic assistance to Africa, and reiterated the determination of the United Nations and the OAU to work "to eliminate colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid in southern Africa." This year's resolution introduced new language calling upon the Secretary General to take certain steps in the search for solutions to Africa's debt and debt-servicing burden. The Representative of Greece made a brief statement in support of the resolution on behalf of the EC-12.

At the request of the U.S. Representative, a recorded vote was taken, and the resolution was adopted 140 to 1 (U.S.). (Resolution 43/12.)

Speaking in explanation after the vote the U.S. Representative, Mr. Harvey Nelson, stressed the U.S. view that "multilateral consideration of the issue of the debt of less developed countries is best confined to legally and technically competent institutions: that is, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and their relevant committees." The United States was concerned, Mr. Nelson continued, that "this resolution, by inviting UN participation, will undermine the strong and effective steps taken so far, with proved success, to address the debt problem on a case-by-case basis." The Delegate of Tanzania responded with regrets that wide consultations and delays of consideration had not led to agreement on the resolution. The General Assembly President took note of the Tanzanian statement.

Hostage-Taking

Enlisting the international community, including the United Nations, in efforts to obtain the release of all hostages remained a priority for the U.S. Government during 1988. Members of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations met twice, in January and in June, with representatives of states which are party to the convention against hostage-taking. These discussions focused on developing a strategy to encourage those states which have not ratified the convention to do so. The United States agreed to lobby a number of governments that have not yet become parties to the convention.

During consideration in July of the Secretary General's semi-annual report on the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and renewal of UNIFIL's 6-month mandate, the Security Council adopted unanimously resolution 618 which called for the release of Lieutenant-Colonel William Richard Higgins. Colonel Higgins was a UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) military observer serving with UNIFIL in southern Lebanon at the time of his abduction in February 1988. The United States and the U.S.S.R. were cosponsors of the resolution.

Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question

The United Kingdom has occupied the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) since 1833. The islands lie 250 miles off the southeastern tip of Argentina, which maintains that it inherited a Spanish claim to them. The 1982 Falklands War initiated by Argentina exacerbated the dispute. The United States takes no position concerning the rival claims to sovereignty and has urged both sides to resolve their differences through diplomatic means.

The British maintain that the question of sovereignty is not negotiable. Argentina has insisted on the inclusion of sovereignty on the agenda of any negotiations. The majority of the 1,800 islanders are of British extraction. In 1986 tensions heightened over fishing rights in the disputed territory. In 1988 tensions again increased over British military exercises on the islands.

On November 17 the General Assembly adopted an Argentine draft resolution on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) by a vote of 109 (U.S.) to 5 with 37 abstentions. (Resolution 43/25.) The resolution, substantively identical to the 1987 and 1986 resolutions, requests that Argentina and the United Kingdom negotiate to resolve "peacefully and definitively the problems pending between both countries, including all aspects on the future of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)," that the Secretary General report on the progress at the 44th General Assembly and that the item again be considered. The United Kingdom emphasized the need for dialogue "without preconditions" and stated that the outcome President Alfonsin envisages is one "unacceptable to the people of the Falkland Islands," noting that the wishes of the Falkland Islanders is at the heart of British policy on this question. Argentina criticized Great Britain's "unacceptable and illogical" refusal to negotiate without preconditions and stated sovereignty is "at the heart of Argentine-British relations." The United States did not speak in the debate.

Situation In Central America

SECURITY COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS

At the request of Nicaragua, on the afternoon of March 18, the UN Security Council convened to consider military activities in Central America. The request followed the March 15 Sandinista-launched offensive against San Andres de Bocay, a major Nicaraguan Resistance stronghold, and the March 16 dispatch of 3,200 U.S. troops by President Reagan in a show of support for Honduras. In its deliberation of events the Security Council heard three principle speakers: the United States, Nicaragua and Honduras. The United States emphasized Nicaragua's failure to uphold its commitments under the Central American peace agreement, its incursion into Honduras and its obvious intent to defeat rather than negotiate with the Nicaraguan Resistance. The Hondurans made a similar statement. No resolution was offered for a vote. The Secretary General, after consulting with the Council, considered Nicaragua's request for a UN-OAS "technical team" to inspect the border area, a request strongly opposed by Honduras during the debate. A four-man team, headed by Gilberto Schlittler, a Brazilian official in charge of UN Security Council Affairs, was sent to Nicaragua from March 23–27. While Honduras refused permission to the team to visit its territory, investigators nonetheless concluded that as many as 4,200 Nicaraguan forces might have carried out incursions about one mile inside Honduran territory, though troop strength had diminished to approximately 1,000 by the time the investigators arrived. U.S. troops were withdrawn within 10 days of arrival.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly adopted by consensus on November 15 a resolution introduced by Guatemala similar to a resolution of 1987 supporting the agreement signed in Guatemala City on August 7, 1987, which has come to be known as Esquipulas II. The resolution entitled "Procedure for the Establishment of a Firm and Lasting Peace in Central America" (Resolution 43/24), requests the Secretary General "to afford the fullest possible support to the Central American Governments in their efforts to achieve peace, especially by taking the measures necessary for the development and effective functioning of the essential verification machinery" and "to submit a report to the General Assembly at its 44th session on the implementation of the present resolution."

Explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador Patricia Byrne stated, "Although the United States joined with other members of this body in adopting this resolution by consensus, we find some troubling developments in Central America that are not adequately reflected in this resolution." The Ambassador noted the violations by Nicaragua of free press, freedom of assembly and free elections, plus election postponement, in violation of Esquipulas II commitments. She also noted the call for international economic cooperation despite absence of progress by Nicaragua to grant basic freedoms.

ICJ Decision on Nicaragua

By a vote of 89 to 2 (U.S.), with 48 abstentions, Nicaragua secured on October 25 General Assembly passage of a resolution calling for "full and immediate compliance" with the June 1986 International Court of Justice decision. Support was diminished by five from the previous year's similar resolution, a notable decrease. Nicaraguans continued to portray themselves as victims of U.S. aggression but left open the possibility of improved relations with the United States. In his statement, Ambassador Okun emphasized that the United States never recognized International Court of Justice jurisdiction in the case, that the ICJ case presented a one-sided picture that ignores the Nicaraguan government's culpability for regional instability and that this resolution did not contribute to peace in the region.

U.S. Trade Embargo Against Nicaragua

The Nicaraguan Delegation tabled a resolution in the Second Committee deploring the continuation of the U.S. trade embargo and seeking its immediate revocation. The United States reiterated its belief that this resolution, similar to those introduced at the 41st and 42nd General Assemblies, was inappropriate and further proof that the Sandinista regime was much more interested in disrupting the work of the Second Committee than in serious dialogue. The United States rejected any implication that U.S. trade restrictions against Nicaragua were illegal or improper under international law. The United States also held that the Second Committee was an inappropriate forum for discussion of this issue. The Second Committee adopted the resolution by a margin of 85 in favor, 2 against (U.S., Israel), and 38 abstentions. The resolution was subsequently adopted in the plenary session by a nearly identical vote, 89 in favor, 2 against (U.S., Israel), and 50 abstentions. (Resolution 43/185.)

In his statement to the Second Committee, Mr. Harry Cahill, the Special Adviser to the 43rd Session of the General Assembly, said that it was unfortunate that the Second Committee's commendable record of achievement had been compromised by Nicaragua's stubborn insistence on interjecting a blatantly political resolution into the Committee's economic discussions. Mr. Cahill noted that this was the third year that Nicaragua had introduced such an unbalanced, provocative and one-sided resolution on this issue into the deliberations of the Second Committee. Although the resolutions have passed every year, nothing had been done to remove the cause of the problem in Nicaragua itself, i.e., the improper and destructive actions taken by Nicaragua against its own people and its neighbors. Mr. Cahill concluded by asking that this blatantly political issue be removed from the Second Committee and expressing the hope that this would be the last time the Second Committee's valuable time was wasted on such a distorted item of this nature.

Cyprus

The Secretary General, assisted by his Special Representative for Cyprus Oscar Camilion, actively pursued his good offices mission during 1988. At UN urging, Cypriot President Vassiliou and Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash began talks under UN auspices in August and agreed to work toward achieving substantial progress on a solution of the Cyprus problem by June 1989. From September through December the two leaders met numerous times in Nicosia. Each side focused on statements of principle, and at year's end the parties remained divided on key substantive issues. Negotiations were scheduled to continue in early 1989.

U.S. officials met with various Cypriot, Turkish and Greek officials throughout the year to underline continuing strong U.S. interest in helping to achieve a peaceful and enduring solution to the Cyprus question and to demonstrate full U.S. support for the Secretary General's initiative.

The Security Council met twice during the year to renew the 6-month mandate of the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). On June 15 the Council unanimously (15 (U.S.) to 0) adopted resolution 614, extending UNFICYP's mandate through December 15. The Council voted unanimously again (15 (U.S.) to 0) on December 15 to renew the mandate until June 15, 1989. (Resolution 625.) Following adoption of the latter resolution, the President of the Security Council made the following statement on behalf of the Council:

> The members of the Security Council expressed their support for the effort launched on 24 August 1988 by the Secretary General in the context of the mission of good offices in Cyprus. They welcomed the readiness of the two parties to seek a negotiated settlement of all aspects of the Cyprus problem by 1 June 1989. They called upon all parties for full cooperation with the Secretary General in ensuring the success of the process currently under way.

The 43rd General Assembly took no action on the agenda item "Question of Cyprus" carried over from previous years. This item, which has not been debated in the Assembly since 1983, was retained on the agenda for the 44th session.

Korean Peninsula

The 43rd General Assembly's General Committee approved on September 21 a compromise agenda item entitled "Promotion of Peace, Reconciliation and Dialogue in the Korean Peninsula" for consideration in plenary debate (plenary item 146). The compromise, which had been worked out between the U.S. and the Chinese delegations, allowed representatives of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, both observer missions to the United Nations, to speak in plenary on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the foundation of their respective republics. There are no plans to consider a similar item for the 44th or subsequent General Assemblies.

President Roh Tae Woo addressed the UN General Assembly on October 18, the first Republic of Korea Head of State to do so. His speech contained four principal points: a proposal for a conference on peace in Northeast Asia with the two Koreas, the United States, the U.S.S.R., China and Japan as participants; an offer to visit Pyongyang to hold talks with North Korean President Kim Il Sung; a declaration that, even without a formal nonaggression arrangement with the North, the South would not be the first to use force; and a call for increased exchanges and family contacts. First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs Kang Sok Ju, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, spoke under the same agenda item on October 19.

DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL

UN Disarmament Commission

The UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) is a subsidiary body of the UN General Assembly and is open to all UN member states. It meets annually in New York for 3 to 4 weeks and deliberates on international security and disarmament issues (differing from the Conference on Disarmament, which is a negotiating organ). In contrast to the General Assembly, the UNDC does not vote on resolutions but adopts consensus recommendations on how specific subjects placed on its agenda by decision of the Assembly should be handled.

The 1988 session of the UNDC was held under the chairmanship of Ambassador Davidson L. Hepburn (Bahamas) from May 2–20. In light of the upcoming special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament (June 1988), this UNDC session was limited to 3 weeks and plenary statements by many UNDC delegations foreshadowed their approach to SSOD III. The UNDC considered a record number of eight substantive agenda items, seven of which were carried over from the 1987 session. These were nuclear/conventional disarmament, reduction of military budgets, South Africa's nuclear capability, the UN role in disarmament, naval arms/disarmament, conventional disarmament and verification. In addition, an item that had last been considered in 1986, namely confidence-building measures, was reintroduced.

In order to facilitate the development of recommendations to the General Assembly, the UNDC traditionally establishes various subsidiary bodies for in-depth consideration of specific issues. In 1988 the UNDC created working groups on four agenda items, namely: South Africa's nuclear capability, the UN role in disarmament, conventional disarmament and verification. A contact group dealt with nuclear/conventional disarmament; and consultation groups were established on reduction of military budgets and confidence-building measures. Finally, the naval arms/disarmament item was handled in consultations conducted by the chairman under his responsibility. A brief description of deliberations on various agenda items follows.

(1) Debate in Working Group I, chaired by Mr. Perera (Sri Lanka) on the question of South-Africa's nuclear capability continued to be deadlocked over the issue of whether this alleged capability is fact or fiction, and over allegations of Israeli collaboration with South-Africa in developing such capability.

(2) Discussions in Working Group II on the Role of the United Nations in Disarmament (ROUND) were conducted under Ambassador Engo (Cameroon), who also chaired the group in 1987. As was the case then, he created an open-ended contact group coordinated by Ambassador Butler (Australia). The contact group considered a working paper that had failed to

gain consensus at the previous session. In anticipation of SSOD III discussions on ROUND, several delegations proposed inclusion of new items in the UNDC report such as involvement of the Security Council in disarmament issues, modifying operations of the CD and expanding the role of the UN Secretary General in disarmament negotiations. These proposals failed to elicit consensus for a variety of reasons. The United States consistently opposed the above-mentioned proposals which aim at the expansion of UN organs or activities into the domain of disarmament; instead, the U.S. position is that the existing machinery is adequate and the proliferation of such machinery would serve no useful purpose.

(3) Working Group III on conventional disarmament, chaired by Ambassador Mellbin (Denmark), deliberated on the basis of the chairman's 1987 working paper without arriving at a consensus text. Among the contentious subjects were arms and technology transfers, regional conventional disarmament, the relationship between nuclear and conventional disarmament and the significance of CBMs. At the end of this inconclusive session, it was recommended that deliberations on this subject be continued at UNDC 1989.

(4) Working Group IV on verification, chaired by Ambassador Roche (Canada), successfully completed its work; the UNDC transmitted its report on this subject to SSOD III for consideration. The report addressed: (a) Principles of verification (a nonexhaustive listing of 16 principles relating to verification of compliance with arms control agreements); (b) Provisions and techniques of verification; and (c) The role of the UN and its member states in the field of verification; this section identified a number of proposals raised and on which consensus was not achieved, such as creation of a UN verification data base, of an integrated multilateral verification system within the United Nations, and of a UN role in formulating and implementing verification provisions of arms control accords. The third U.S. submission to the UN Secretary General on the subject of Verification in all its Aspects (Document A/CN.10/106/Add.l) which complemented previous U.S. statements on verification in 1987 (A/CN.10/87/Add.l), and 1986 (A/41/422/Add.2) reiterated the U.S. position that there is no generic UN role and that any specific role of the United Nations in this domain should be defined by the parties involved in arms control negotiations.

(5) Deliberations on the perennial item, nuclear/conventional disarmament, under contact group coordinator Mr. Martynov (Byelorussia), were inconclusive. Fundamental differences remained on the general approach, as well as on many of the proposed recommendations under this item. In fact, the inclusion this year of additional controversial proposals further burdened the text. The item was again deferred, as in previous years, despite suggestions by several Western delegations to discontinue these unsuccessful deliberations at the next UNDC.

(6) The consultation group on Reduction of Military Budgets (ROMB), chaired by Mr. Melescanu (Romania), arrived at a consensus on 14 "Principles which should govern further actions of states in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets," but failed to reach agreement on the principles of transparency and comparability (paragraph 7). Continued disagreement on these critical concepts reflects the history of the ROMB exercise, which always involved an East-West dispute over methods of measuring, freezing and comparing military expenditures. Central to the ROMB debate is the use (or non-use) of the UN standardized reporting instrument for military expenditures on an annual basis, a point strongly advocated by the West (United States, Federal Republic of Germany, France, United Kingdom and Italy) and resisted by most Eastern and some non-aligned states. Because of continued disagreement over the principles of transparency/comparability, advocated by the West and opposed by the East, paragraph 7 was bracketed. A number of countries reserved the right to review the entire text on ROMB if and when the outstanding paragraph 7 is agreed upon in the future. In resolution 43/73, the General Assembly referred ROMB to the UNDC in 1989 for further discussion.

(7) The Consultation Group on Confidence-Building Measures, chaired by Ambassador Hepburn, addressed the three unagreed paragraphs of the draft CBM guidelines developed by the UNDC in 1986. In one paragraph, the East in particular emphasized political declarations in contrast to the importance placed by the West and others on concrete measures. Others sought deletion of Western language highlighting the need for CBMs to be of military significance. Some delegations also disputed the relevance of the "Euro-centric CBM concept" for other regions. The UNDC succeeded in arbitrating these differences and in arriving at a consensus on a complete set of "Guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level." This set of agreed guidelines was recommended for consideration by the SSOD III.

(8) Consultations on naval arms and disarmament were conducted under the chairman's responsibility and coordinated by Ambassador Ekeus (Sweden). As in previous years, the United States did not participate in the informal discussions, based upon the position that naval armaments cannot be considered in isolation from other military forces for purposes of arms control. No conclusions were arrived at in these discussions.

At the conclusion of its session, the UNDC submitted its traditional report to the 43rd General Assembly, as well as a special report to SSOD III. The General Assembly adopted the UNDC Report in a consensus resolution (43/78 A) which requests the UNDC to meet for a period not exceeding 4 weeks during 1989 and to submit a substantive report to the 44th General Assembly.

Conference on Disarmament

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) is a forum for the consideration of and, as appropriate, negotiation on, multilateral arms control and disarmament issues. It has 40 members, including the five nuclear-weapon states.* The CD is an autonomous body with its own rules of procedure. It is, however, linked to the United Nations through a personal representative of the Secretary General, who serves as Secretary General of the Conference. The United Nations also provides administrative support to the Conference through the regular UN budget. The Conference reports annually on its activities to the General Assembly, and resolutions adopted by the Assembly frequently request the Conference to consider specific disarmament matters.

The CD meets each year in a two-part session. In 1988 the Conference met from February 2–April 29, and July 7–September 20. The U.S. Representative to the CD was Ambassador Max Friedersdorf, who headed a delegation of officials drawn from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Departments of State, Defense and Energy; and the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. During its 1988 session, the CD held 48 formal plenary meetings and 18 informal meetings. The CD's rules of procedure provide that nonmember states may, on request, submit papers and make statements at formal plenary meetings, as well as at meetings of subsidiary bodies of the CD. Accordingly, during 1988, a number of nonmember states also participated in various Conference activities.

The CD addressed a wide range of disarmament issues during 1988. Those items receiving the most attention were: chemical weapons; outer space arms control; nuclear test ban; nuclear disarmament; the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters; new weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons; negative security assurances and a comprehensive program of disarmament. As in the past, the CD formed *ad hoc* committees to deal with some of the specific issues. Five such *ad hoc* committees were reestablished from the 1987 session on: chemical weapons, radiological weapons, arms control in outer space, a comprehensive program of disarmament and negative security assurances.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Chemical Weapons

The Conference's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons was reestablished in February 1988 with a mandate to, *inter alia*, "continue the full and complete process of negotiations, developing and working out the convention, except for its final drafting . . . with a view to giving the conference a possibility to achieve an agreement as soon as possible." The 1988 report of the chemical weapons *Ad Hoc* Committee was adopted on September 20, updating the "rolling text" of the convention to reflect work done in 1988.

---

*The Conference members are: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

In the CD negotiations in 1988 there was greater recognition of the need for a global approach to the problem of chemical weapons and more attention was given to security concerns, particularly verification issues. Progress on a variety of issues was registered, but there remain important issues which are as yet unresolved. The CD must still identify and negotiate detailed procedures necessary to assure adequate verification, including arrangements to monitor nonproduction of chemical weapons by civilian chemical industries. Also, the issue of how to ensure the security of states during the stockpile destruction period must be addressed. Finally, important differences remain on a number of issues such as treaty implementing provisions, allocation of costs, and the nature and extent of assistance that might be provided nations that have been attacked or are threatened by chemical weapons. CD participants began the work of preparing for a series of trial inspections in the chemical industry. The results of inspections organized by nations individually in their own industries will provide valuable experience for defining the regime for monitoring the civilian chemical industry under a chemical weapons convention.

During 1988 chemical weapons negotiations were also the focus of U.S.-Soviet bilateral discussions designed to facilitate the multilateral negotiations. The chemical weapons negotiations were discussed at the U.S.-Soviet ministerial and summit meetings. In addition, pursuant to a 1985 summit agreement to accelerate chemical weapons negotiations, the United Sates and Soviet Union held three bilateral meetings on chemical weapons treaty issues on the margins of the CD. Outside the CD, three U.S.-Soviet bilateral sessions were held to discuss ways to prevent the dangerous proliferation of chemical weapons. Moreover, the United States held informal talks with Western countries to discuss ways to optimize export controls on specific chemicals related to the manufacture of chemical weapons.

Outer Space Arms Control

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on the "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space" was reestablished in 1988, with a mandate similar to that adopted in 1987, involving the examination of issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, existing agreements and existing proposals, and future initiatives. Thus far, neither the United States, nor the CD, has been able to identify any outer space arms control issues appropriate for multilateral negotiations.

Radiological Weapons

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons was reestablished in 1988 with a view to reaching agreement on a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. The Committee continued its examination of two major issues that have been before it for a number of years: Contact Group A considered the prohibition of radiological weapons as such, while Contact Group B considered the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities. On both issues, major differences over substance and approach continued to exist.

Comprehensive Program of Disarmament

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD) met again during 1988 to discuss "the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control." Despite intensive efforts, the Committee was unable to resolve the numerous outstanding issues and agreed to recommend that work on the elaboration of a CPD be continued during the 1989 CD session. Discussions were based on a draft text annexed to the special report submitted to SSOD III. It was understood that no agreement on individual sections of the text was considered final until the entire document was agreed upon by all CD member states.

Negative Security Assurances

The *Ad Hoc* Committee to consider "effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons" against them, met again in 1988, and examined proposals for a common formula of security assurances to be included in an legally binding international instrument. The five nuclear-weapon states have offered unilateral assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon states; the U.S. assurances, first offered in 1978, stand as a reliable statement of U.S. policy. However, the Committee made little progress on the question of international arrangements, given the differing perceptions of security interests of nuclear and non-nuclear- weapon states.

OTHER ISSUES

In addition to the work of the *ad hoc* committees, the Conference addressed a number of other issues, including the following:

Nuclear Test Ban

As is customary, the agenda item on a "Nuclear Test Ban" was considered in plenary. In addition, efforts were made to find a basis to continue work on this item in an *ad hoc* committee of the Conference. While no delegation opposed the reestablishment of such a body, which has not met since 1983, there was no agreement on what its mandate should be; thus a committee was not established in 1988. There were several proposals on the table in this regard. The Western initiative, first put forward in 1984 by a number of Western states (CD/521), including the United States, proposed that such a committee be established to resume its substantive examination of specific issues relating to a nuclear test ban, including the issues of scope, verification and compliance, was still on the table. In 1985 the United States also joined other Western states in proposing a detailed program of work for a committee (CD/621), under the mandate proposed in CD/521. Proposals made by the G–21 and the socialist group (CD/829 and CD/863) called for multilateral negotiation of a nuclear test ban. The United States and others maintained that the CD had not completed the work commenced in previous sessions of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group and that such work should be completed prior to reconsidering the focus of the CD's efforts. The Conference's *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events met twice during 1988, and submitted its progress reports containing recommendations which were subsequently adopted by the CD.

Prevention of Nuclear War, Including All Related Matters

This subject was first included on the CD's agenda in 1983, as part of the nuclear disarmament agenda item. In 1984 the CD decided to accord it a separate place on the agenda. A wide range of views was expressed in plenary consideration of this issue to determine how the Conference might best further treat this item in 1988. The West continued to emphasize the need for preventing all wars (not just nuclear wars). Since there was no agreement on establishing an *ad hoc* group, the issue was discussed in plenary.

Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament

This item was again discussed in plenary and several new documents were submitted on this subject; no agreement was reached on establishing an *ad hoc* committee. The United States (and U.S.S.R.) pointed to tangible progress in bilateral arms reductions negotiations (e.g. entry into force of the INF Treaty) and emphasized the importance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty for international security and stability.

Membership

In 1983 the Conference accepted in principle a limited expansion in its membership, not exceeding four states. A number of countries have submitted requests for membership: Norway, Finland, Austria, Turkey, Senegal, Bangladesh, Spain, Viet Nam, Ireland, Tunisia, Ecuador, Cameroon, Greece, Zimbabwe and New Zealand. Consultations on expanding CD membership were held in 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987 and again in 1988, but there was no consensus on the proposed candidates.

Special Report to SSOD III

In 1988 the CD had to submit a special report to the Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament (held in New York from May 31–June 26), in addition to the annual report to the 43rd session of the Assembly.

General Assembly Consideration

Although the UN Charter adopted in 1945 gave no immediate priority to disarmament, it provides that the "General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments."

The advent of nuclear weapons came only weeks after the signing of the UN Charter, and provided immediate impetus to concepts of arms limitation and disarmament. In fact, the first resolution of the first meeting of the General Assembly (January 24, 1946) was entitled, "The Establishment of a Commission to Deal with the Problems Raised by the Discovery of Atomic Energy," and called upon the Commission to make specific proposals for "the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction."

Since the early years of the United Nations, great-power disagreement has hampered efforts to promote arms control and disarmament within the UN system. However, the United Nations has undertaken continuing efforts to develop organizational machinery that can effectively address disarmament issues.

FIRST COMMITTEE DISARMAMENT ISSUES

In mid-October of each year, the First Committee of the General Assembly convenes to consider arms control and disarmament issues. The Committee holds general debates, considers specific aspects of arms control issues on its agenda, adopts resolutions on these issues, and forwards them to the General Assembly for further action.

During its 1988 session, the Committee adopted a total of 73 resolutions and 2 decisions, all related in some way to disarmament. These resolutions addressed such subjects as nuclear weapons and testing, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction, verification, weapons transfers, compliance with arms control agreements and studies related to these subjects.

More specifically, the First Committee adopted three resolutions relating to earlier disarmament studies. Resolution 43/75 D, introduced by Denmark, requested the UN Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of conventional disarmament (which had been the subject of an earlier report) at its 1989 session; it was adopted without a vote. Another resolution, introduced by Sweden, recalled the study on the naval arms race and requested the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of this subject at its 1989 session. This resolution was adopted in plenary by a vote of 152 to 1 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. (Resolution 43/75 L.) The United States voted against this resolution, *inter alia,* because the United States considers the notion that naval armaments can be examined independently without reference to land-based armaments as well to be faulty. A Romanian resolution on the study of the Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race (ESCAR) was adopted by a vote of 143 to 1(U.S.), with 9 abstentions. (Resolution 43/78 J.) The United States, which participated in the ESCAR study, voted against the resolution because it contradicted Western deterrence doctrines and made assertions about the alleged inverse relationship between security and arms expenditures which had no basis in fact.

Several resolutions were adopted by the First Committee that were intended to encourage international disarmament measures by focusing attention on the general questions involved, or on the institutional mechanisms available to the world community. These resolutions addressed such issues as: objective information on military matters, a resolution co-sponsored by the United States and United Kingdom and supported by the U.S.S.R. and its allies, adopted in the General Assembly plenary by a vote of 130 (U.S.) to 8, with 10 abstentions (Resolution 43/75 G); the observance of Disarmament Week, adopted without a vote (Resolution 43/78 G); a review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament, adopted without a vote (Resolution 43/75 R); and international cooperation for disarmament, adopted by the plenary by a vote of 136 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. (Resolution 43/78 C.)

As in previous years, the First Committee adopted a resolution of an institutional nature in the disarmament field to which the United States took exception. It called upon the UN Security Council, particularly its Permanent Members, to take steps to enhance the role of the United Nations in arms limitation and disarmament, primarily in the nuclear field. It also recommended that the Council consider establishing subsidiary bodies to facilitate a solution to disarmament issues. The resolution was adopted in the plenary on December 7 by a vote of 129 to 1 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 43/76 A.)

Some resolutions dealt with restrictions on the use of certain types of weapons. Resolution 43/67 concerns the Convention on the Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or Have Indiscriminate Effects. Resolution 43/74 B deals with the outcome of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction. Both of these resolutions were adopted without a vote.

Finally, the First Committee approved several hortatory resolutions emphasizing the obligation of member states to take concrete measures toward disarmament. Resolution 43/75 E, introduced by China, encouraged all states, including the "member states of the two major military alliances," to take appropriate steps to promote progress in conventional disarmament; it was adopted without a vote. In support of the resolution, the U.S. Delegate said:

> The U.S. Delegation has long advocated greater attention of the First Committee to conventional disarmament, and we have supported the commendable work in this field of the Danish Delegation that introduced this resolution . . .

Resolution 43/75 S, introduced by Peru, expressed firm support for efforts by regional groups of states to take concrete steps toward negotiating regional agreements on conventional disarmament; it was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 125 to 0, with 23 abstentions (U.S.). In this connection, the U.S. Delegate made the following explanation of vote:

> Mr. Chairman, our Delegation supports the underlying principles embodied in resolution L. 70/Rev.1. We have in the past voted in favor of similar resolutions. We regret that the particular formulation of the present version did not allow us to vote in favor . . . If there are similar resolutions introduced in future sessions of this Committee, we will continue to work cooperatively toward consensus language.

Resolution 43/75 H, introduced by Czechoslovakia, deemed it important that member states make every effort to facilitate the implementation of General Assembly resolutions in the field of disarmament. It was adopted by the plenary by a vote of 131 to 2 (U.S.), with 20 abstentions. The United States explained that it voted against this resolution because Assembly resolutions on disarmament are strictly recommendations and there is no basis in the Charter for according them any kind of binding status.

Several resolutions dealt with new subjects or new variations of old themes. A French resolution, for example, cosponsored by seven other West and East European states, noted the great importance of conventional force negotiations in Europe and urged the participants in the process of confidence and security-building in Europe to contribute actively to attain their objectives. The United States joined consensus on this resolution. (Resolution 43/75 P.) A Nigerian resolution continued the UN practice of designating substantive decades for work in particular fields by designating the 1990's as the Third Disarmament Decade, as it had declared the 1970's the First Disarmament Decade and the 1980's the Second Disarmament Decade. The United States joined consensus on this item. (Resolution 43/78 L.)

Nigeria also submitted a resolution (with eight other non-aligned cosponsors) on dumping of radioactive wastes for hostile purposes. It called upon states to ensure that no dumping of nuclear wastes occur that would infringe on the sovereignty of states and requested that the Conference on Disarmament consider the matter. The resolution was passed by a vote of 129 (U.S.) to 1, with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 43/75 Q.) A Zairian resolution on the same subject was passed by a vote of 141 to 0, with 13 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States objected to the linkage of nuclear wastes with security questions, found that the resolution introduced commercial and environmental issues that fall outside the competence of the First Committee, and condemned alleged dumping of nuclear waste in Africa despite lack of evidence that this had actually occurred. (Resolution 43/75 T.)

A Colombian resolution eventually cosponsored by 20 states called for more openness and transparency in international arms transfers, while deploring their known and potential negative effects on social economic development, as well as on international peace and security. It also requested the Secretary General to carry out a study on the question of promoting transparency in arms transfers. It was adopted by a vote of 110 to 1, with 38 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 43/75 I.) The U.S. abstention was not only because of the budgetary implications of the projected study, but also because the United States believes that the assertion that arms have a negative effect on peaceful social and economic development ignores the fact that armaments are the result of political tensions.

Two resolutions were introduced endorsing conferences reviewing multilateral arms control treaties. One, submitted by Norway, officially endorsed a preparatory committee for the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea Bed and in the Subsoil Thereof (the Seabed Treaty) and asked the Secretary General to assist the holding of a Review Conference in 1989. Cosponsored by 44 states (including the United States), the resolution was adopted by consensus. (Resolution 43/75 M.) The second resolution, submitted by the United Kingdom, treated in similar language the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Cosponsored by a total of 119 members (including the United States, it was also adopted by consenses. (Resolution 43/82.)

In addition, the Committee adopted and forwarded to the General Assembly a considerable number of resolutions of special interest. These are treated in greater detail in the following sections.

A few peace resolutions are handled outside the First Committee. For example, a Mongolian resolution on the "Right of Peoples to Peace" was adopted directly by the General Assembly by a vote of 118 to 0 to 29 (U.S.). It called upon states to implement the declaration of the same name approved in 1984 by the 39th General Assembly. The United States abstained because of the view that declarations such as these do nothing in themselves to advance the cause of peace. (Resolution 43/22.)

Another resolution was introduced by Costa Rica and cosponsored by 45 states. Entitled "Science and Peace," it was adopted without a vote by the General Assembly on December 6 after approval by the Special Political Committee on November 9. The measure proclaimed each week in which November 11 falls as "International Week of Science and Peace," and encouraged activities during that week leading to the study and dissemination of information on links between progress in science and technology and the maintenance of international peace and security. (Resolution 43/61.)

PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR

Since 1981, non-aligned countries have proposed resolutions in the General Assembly expressing the urgent need to take steps to prevent nuclear war and calling on the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations to that end.

The traditional Argentine resolution, was introduced again on October 31. The text was substantially similar to that of previous years. Describing the issue as a matter of the highest priority, it requested the Conference on Disarmament once again to establish an *ad hoc* committee to negotiate measures designed to prevent nuclear war.

The Argentine resolution was approved in the First Committee on November 11 by a vote of 116 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions, and adopted in the Assembly plenary on December 7 by 136 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. The United States voted against the resolution because of its attempts to arrogate to the First Committee authority reserved to the Conference on Disarmament to decide its own work program, and because the United States believes it is necessary to prevent all wars, not just nuclear war. (Resolution 43/78 F.)

RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Since 1979, when the United States and the Soviet Union submitted a joint proposal on the major elements of such a treaty to the Conference on Disarmament, the General Assembly has adopted resolutions supporting the negotiation of a convention to ban the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons. These resolutions for the most part had been adopted each year without a vote.

The 1988 version of the resolution on a radiological weapons convention was tabled on October 28 by the United Kingdom, in its capacity as chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons during the 1988 session of the Conference on Disarmament, and was cosponsored by Indonesia, Sweden and Hungary. It was largely procedural and essentially similar to its predecessors. The resolution recognized the utility of the work performed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons during 1988 and requested the Conference on Disarmament to continue its negotiations toward a convention to ban radiological weapons.

The resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee on ovember 14, and in the plenary on December 7. (Resolution 43/75 C.)

As it has done in previous years, Iraq introduced its own resolution on adiological weapons on October 31. Asserting that Israel's 1981 attack on an raqi nuclear facility constituted an unprecedented danger to international eace and security, the resolution declared that military attacks of any kind gainst nuclear installations were "tantamount to the use of radiological weapons" and requested the Conference on Disarmament to reach early agreement on the prohibition of such attacks. The United States voted against this resolution because of its one-sided criticism of Israel and because the United States neither accepts the premise that a treaty banning radiological weapons should deal with attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities nor has concluded that additional legal measures for protection against attacks on nuclear facilities are appropriate.

The Iraqi resolution was approved in the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 99 to 2 (U.S.), with 30 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 7 by a vote of 116 to 2 (U.S.), with 29 abstentions. (Resolution 43/75 J.) The U.S. Delegate explained the American view in the following explanation of vote:

> . . . [O]ur Delegation has voted against resolution L. 25. In our view, this resolution prejudges the outcome of the discussions in the Conference on Disarmament. Moreover, the text of this resolution is technically inaccurate in its argument, in operative paragraph one, that an armed attack against a nuclear facility would necessarily lead to the release of "dangerous radioactive forces."

DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

The question of a relationship between disarmament and development was first considered at the First Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD-I) in 1978 and has been the subject of General Assembly resolutions in recent years. In 1983, on the initiative of President Mitterrand of France, the Assembly adopted a resolution which placed the issue on the UN Disarmament Commission's 1984 agenda. The 39th General Assembly (1984) adopted a resolution, introduced by France, which decided to convene an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development in 1986 and which also established a 54-member Preparatory Committee (PrepCom). Although the United States joined in the consensus adoption of this resolution, it did not participate in the work of the PrepCom when it first met in August 1985, because of skepticism about the value of the proposed conference.

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution that recommended acceptance of a provisional agenda submitted by the PrepCom for the conference and set 1986 as the year for convening the conference in Paris. The United States decided in April 1986 that it would not attend the conference because the United States does not accept the premise that there is necessarily a causal relationship between disarmament in the developed world and development in the developing world. Two months later, in response to a request by France, the resumed session of the 40th General Assembly formally deferred the conference until 1987.

In accordance with a decision adopted without a vote by the 41st General Assembly in 1986, the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development was held at UN headquarters in New York from August 24 to September 11, 1987. Consistent with its policy decision of April 1986, the United States did not participate in the Assembly's adoption of this decision, nor did it participate in the conference itself. The conference adopted a final document and a program of action which ran counter to several aspects of U.S. policy.

On October 28 at the 43rd General Assembly, Zimbabwe, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, circulated a draft resolution on "The Relationship Between Disarmament and Development." A revised draft was submitted on November 9. The resolution requested the Secretary General "to take action through the appropriate organs, within available resources, for the implementation of the action program as adopted at the International Conference" and to submit a report to the 44th General Assembly.

Not only does the United States not accept the basic premise of a purported relationship between disarmament and development, but the United States was also particularly troubled by the resolution's request to the Secretary General to take steps to implement the conference's program of action. Prior to the First Committee's consideration of and action on the Zimbabwian resolution, U.S. Ambassador Max Friedersdorf explained why the United States was not participating in this action:

> The U.S. Delegation wishes to announce that we will not participate in whatever action the First Committee will take on draft resolution L.8 Rev.1.
>
> As everyone knows, the United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered appropriately in terms of an interrelationship between these two disparate subjects.
>
> Consequently, the United States declined to participate in the recent international conference on this matter, and has refrained from participating in both the drafting of L.8 and the subsequent debate in this committee.
>
> For these reasons, the U.S. Delegation requests that the permanent record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States has not participated in the consideration of draft resolution L.8. At the same time, our Delegation takes this opportunity to state that the U.S. Government does not and will not consider itself bound or committed in any way by either the declarations in the "Final Document" of the recent international conference or the terms of draft resolution L.8.

The First Committee approved the resolution without a vote on November 10. Prior to consideration of this item in the General Assembly plenary on December 7, the U.S. Representative repeated the statement of the U.S.

position. The Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote. (Resolution 43/75 B.)

INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

The 43rd General Assembly and its First Committee considered several initiatives of a largely institutional nature. On October 31 Nigeria introduced its traditional resolution on the UN program of disarmament fellowships. An essentially procedural resolution, it recalled and reaffirmed the decision of the Second Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD II) to increase the number of fellowships from 20 to 25. The resolution asked the Secretary General to implement the program within existing resources and also expressed appreciation to those governments, such as the United States, which had hosted the disarmament fellows in 1988. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 14 without a vote. It was approved by the General Assembly on December 7, also without a vote. (Resolution 43/76 F.)

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a UN Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. The Center was inaugurated in Lome, Togo, on October 24, 1986. In a follow-up action, Tanzania introduced a resolution on October 31 in the Committee which welcomed the inauguration of the Center and requested the Secretary General to furnish it with "all necessary support." The text also appealed to states and nongovernmental organizations to make contributions to the Center. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 14 and by the General Assembly on December 7, in both cases by consensus. (Resolution 43/76 D.)

In 1986 the 41st General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a UN Regional Center for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America. The Center was inaugurated on October 9, 1987, in Lima, Peru. At the 43rd UN General Assembly, Peru introduced a follow-up resolution in the First Committee on October 31 which welcomed the inauguration of the Center and called upon states and nongovernmental organizations to make contributions to it. The resolution also welcomed the Center's holding of a conference of experts in May 1988 on strengthening peace, disarmament, development and security in Latin America under the World Disarmament Campaign, and recommended that it hold two meetings in 1989. Likewise, it called on member states and international organizations to make voluntary contributions to the Center's operations and renamed it the "Regional Center of the United Nations for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean." An orally revised version was presented on November 14 and was approved that day by the First Committee without a vote; the General Assembly also approved it without a vote on December 7. (Resolution 43/76 H.)

At the 43rd General Assembly, on October 31 Nepal introduced a draft resolution which recalled the 1987 Assembly resolution establishing a UN

Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament in Asia. It commended the administrative support given by the Secretary General to the Center and invited member states and interested organizations to make voluntary contributions to assist the Center's functioning.

The resolution was adopted without a vote by the First Committee on November 14 and by the General Assembly plenary, also without a vote, on December 7. (Resolution 43/76 G.)

As it had done in previous years, Yugoslavia on October 31 tabled a resolution on the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament. Rather than being merely a procedural text designed to take note of the report of the CD, which had itself been adopted by consensus, the resolution again urged the Conference to undertake substantive negotiations on various disarmament questions which the United States does not consider appropriate for multilateral negotiation, such as a nuclear-test ban. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 17 by a vote of 117 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 7 by a vote of 136 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 43/78 M.)

On behalf of a number of Western countries, the Netherlands on October 27 introduced a competing resolution on the same subject. Largely procedural in nature, the resolution took note of the report of the 1987 session of the CD and asked the Conference to submit a report on its work in 1988 to the 43rd General Assembly. However, it also contained several formulations, such as the assertion that the CD should play a central role in implementing the Action Program in the Final Document of the First Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD I), which the United States considered to be extraneous to what was intended to be a purely procedural resolution. Accordingly, the United States abstained. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 17 by a vote of 73 to 0, with 53 (U.S.) abstentions, and in the plenary on December 7 by a vote of 96 to 0, with 53 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 43/78 I.)

Another institutional resolution was one introduced by the Bahamas on October 31 which took note of the annual report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and requested the Commission to continue its work in 1989 in accordance with its mandate and "to make every effort to achieve specific recommendations. . . on the outstanding items on its agenda, taking into account the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly." An oral revision to the text was made on November 10 and it was approved the same day by the First Committee without a vote. It was approved by the plenary without a vote on December 7. (Resolution 43/78 A.)

BILATERAL NUCLEAR-ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

The General Assembly has passed several resolutions over the years dealing with the U.S.-Soviet negotiations on nuclear arms reductions. The resolutions generally have welcomed the conclusion of previous negotiations and urged the two participants to undertake further efforts in this field. At the 43rd General Assembly, interest in this issue was heightened in the First Committee following the ratification and the coming into force of the U.S.-Soviet Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty designed to eliminate an entire class of weapons. Two resolutions which dealt with these negotiations were adopted by the Committee.

As in previous years, the United Kingdom took the lead in presenting the Western viewpoint on the bilateral talks in a resolution. While consistent with the Western approach, however, the resolution was also designed to be acceptable to all states. Introduced in the First Committee on October 31, it welcomed the U.S.-Soviet INF Treaty and called upon the two governments to "spare no effort" in attaining their agreed objectives in the negotiations, particularly the achievement of a 50 percent cut in their strategic offensive arms. The U.K. resolution also expressed the "firmest possible encouragement and support for the bilateral negotiations and their successful conclusion." The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 70 (U.S.) to 0, with 58 abstentions, and by the General Assembly on December 7 by 103 (U.S.) to 0, with 46 abstentions. (Resolution 43/75 O.)

On behalf of the non-aligned countries, Zimbabwe introduced a resolution entitled "Bilateral Nuclear-Arms Negotiations" on October 28. It welcomed the ratification of the U.S.-Soviet INF treaty, and urged efforts to achieve a 50 percent reduction in strategic arms, while insisting on the "complementarity" of bilateral and multilateral arms negotiations and warning of the "continuing escalation" of the arms race. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 120 to 0 with 13 abstentions (U.S.) and by the plenary on December 7, by a vote of 141 to 8 with 12 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 43/75 A.) The text contained some language which the United States found extraneous and objectionable.

On October 31 China also introduced a resolution which, although entitled "Nuclear Disarmament," was largely focused on the U.S.-Soviet negotiations. Like the other resolutions on this subject, it welcomed the signing and ratification by the two governments of a treaty eliminating their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The resolution further urged the United States and the Soviet Union "to negotiate in earnest with a view to reaching early agreement on the drastic reduction of their nuclear arsenals." It also stated that bilateral and multilateral efforts for nuclear disarmament should complement and facilitate each other. The First Committee approved the resolution without a vote on November 11. It was adopted by the plenary, also without a vote, on December 7. (Resolution 43/75 E.)

NON-USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The 43rd General Assembly, as in previous years, adopted two resolutions concerning non-use of nuclear weapons.

On October 31, on behalf of 13 cosponsors, India submitted a resolution in the First Committee entitled, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons," which paralleled similar resolutions it has introduced since 1978. As in earlier resolutions, this draft criticized nuclear deterrence and declared that "the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity." It requested "the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations . . . on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances." The resolution also incorporated the text of a proposed convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

The United States once again opposed the resolution on several grounds: the UN Charter provides no basis for such a declaration; and it neither prohibits the use of force in self-defense nor outlaws nuclear weapons for defense or deterrence. The United States also pointed out that in many parts of the world, nuclear weapons are a central part of security arrangements that have maintained peace.

On November 10 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 112 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions.

The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution December 7 by a vote of 133 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 43/76 E.)

On October 27 the German Democratic Republic, along with three of its allies, introduced its traditional resolution entitled, "Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons and Prevention of Nuclear War." It welcomed the declarations on non-first use of nuclear weapons made by two nuclear-weapon states. The resolution appealed to those nuclear-weapon states which have not yet done so to consider making similar declarations renouncing first use of nuclear weapons. It also requested the Conference on Disarmament to consider "the elaboration of an international instrument of a legally binding character laying down the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons." The United States, as in past years, opposed this resolution in part because the concept of non-first-use of nuclear weapons is contrary to nuclear deterrence.

On November 11 the First Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 104 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. On December 7 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 127 to 17 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 43/78 B.)

NUCLEAR FREEZE

The 43rd General Assembly considered and adopted the traditional Mexican resolution calling for a freeze on nuclear weapons. Mexico's resolution, which had 7 cosponsors, was introduced on October 31. A revised version was tabled on November 15. It welcomed the improvement in

U.S.-Soviet relations, the INF Treaty, and the agreement in principle to negotiate a 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear armaments. It postulated that a nuclear arms freeze would be an effective step to prevent the qualitative improvement in existing nuclear weaponry during further negotiations on nuclear arms reductions. Consequently, it urged a total stoppage in further production of nuclear weapons and a complete cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. The resolution also called for a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. All these measures would be subject to "appropriate and effective measures and procedures of verification." Finally, the resolution called upon the nuclear weapons states to submit a report to the 44th General Assembly on its implementation.

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee, November 17, by a vote of 116 to 13 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. The General Assembly adopted it on December 7 by a vote of 135 to 12 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. India joined in 1988 as cosponsor and did not present its own traditional nuclear freeze resolution. (Resolution 43/76 B.)

The United States traditionally opposes these resolutions for a number of reasons, such as the view that a freeze on the production and testing of nuclear weapons would undermine such Western defense concepts as deterrence and flexible response.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

At the 43rd General Assembly, a total of three resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on the subject of chemical and biological weapons, a reflection of the continuing concern within the international community over reports of the use and proliferation of such weapons.

On October 31 Australia presented a draft resolution entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and to support the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention" to the First Committee. A revised draft was tabled on November 14, with 26 cosponsors, including the United States. Building upon the Australian and U.S.-sponsored resolution from last year, the document expressed deep dismay at the use of chemical weapons in violation of the Geneva Protocol, recalled relevant Security Council resolutions, renewed the call to all states to observe strictly the principles and objectives of the Protocol, vigorously condemned all actions that violate this obligation, called upon all states that have not done so to accede to the Protocol, urged the Conference on Disarmament to pursue negotiations toward a global ban on chemical weapons development, stockpiling and use, and requested the UN Secretary General to carry out promptly investigations of reports of use of chemical and bacteriological or toxin weapons in violation of the Geneva Protocol or other rules of customary international law. In addition, it requested the Secretary General's Group of

Experts to continue to develop further technical guidelines and procedures for the timely and efficient investigation of reports of chemical weapons, bacteriological weapons, or toxin use. The resolution was eventually cosponsored by 31 member states, including the United States and U.S.S.R. It was approved without a vote in the First Committee on November 16 and by the plenary on December 7. Thus, for the second straight year, the resolution was adopted by consensus, demonstrating widespread concern over use of chemical weapons. (Resolution 43/74 A.)

Canada and Poland introduced their traditional draft resolution on October 31 in the First Committee on the negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a chemical weapons convention which was similar to others introduced by the two countries and adopted by consensus over the past several years. Cosponsored by 33 states, it urged the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its negotiations on a convention to prohibit the "development, production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons" during its 1989 session and to increase the amount of time that it devotes to such negotiations. It encouraged member states to promote confidence and openness in the negotiations. It also welcomed the offer of the French Government to convene a conference of States Parties to the Geneva Protocol in Paris from January 7–11 1989, along with other UN member and observer states. The French had followed up President Reagan's proposal made in his speech of September 26 to the 43rd General Assembly, to hold an international conference to consider action that could be taken to reverse the serious erosion of respect for the 1925 Geneva Protocol and other international norms against use of chemical weapons. The resolution, with 32 cosponsors, was adopted without a vote in both the First Committee (November 16) and in the plenary (December 7). (Resolution 43/74 C.)

In addressing the First Committee on November 16, U.S. Representative Max Friedersdorf reaffirmed strong U.S. support for the January, 1989 conference in Paris on chemical weapons use and for the Geneva chemical weapons negotiations. He encouraged other delegations to make the necessary commitment to resolve remaining differences.

> Our Delegation has joined in support of one of the most important resolutions on which this Committee is taking action during its 1988 session. That is resolution L. 67, dealing with the ongoing negotiations on chemical weapons in the Conference on Disarmament and with the forthcoming conference on chemical weapons use and the 1925 Geneva Protocol. I want to once again reaffirm our strong support both for the conference in Paris and for the Geneva negotiations. We fully expect that the conference on CW use will provide an opportunity to reaffirm, and thereby to strengthen, our mutual commitment to the prohibitions contained in the Geneva Protocol and other customary rules of international law. In addition, we fully expect that conference to provide a strong impetus to the negotiations on-going in Geneva.
>
> Operative paragraph three of L. 67 calls for the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its negotiations, including by such means as increasing the time devoted to them. Our delegation believes that this aspect of Paragraph Three should be placed in proper perspective. In our view, the question is not much whether a given number of days or

hours are set aside for negotiations, but rather whether the negotiating time is being used productively and efficiently by all CD members . . . We encourage other delegations that have not yet entered the dialogue across the full range of issues to make the necessary commitment to do so, and to intensify their efforts to resolve remaining differences . . .

Another resolution, dealing with biological weapons and cosponsored by 38 states, including the United States and the Soviet Union, was introduced by Austria on October 31. It recalled the work of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC RevCon), which took place in Geneva in September 1986. The resolution noted with satisfaction that in accordance with the RevCon's Final Declaration, an *Ad Hoc* Meeting of Scientific and Technical Experts met in March/April 1987 and adopted a report establishing the means for an exchange of information and data among parties to the Convention. The resolution noted witn satisfaction that the second exchange of information had commenced and called upon states which had not yet exchanged information or had not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention to do so. The United States has been providing such information. The resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee (November 16) and in the plenary (November 30). (Resolution 42/74 B.)

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

In 1988 the 43rd General Assembly considered and adopted three resolutions dealing with nuclear testing issues.

A resolution entitled "Cessation of All Nuclear-Test Explosions" (A/C.1/43/L. 13) was introduced in the First Committee by Mexico on October 28 and cosponsored by nine other states. Describing a nuclear-test-ban treaty as a matter of the "highest priority," the resolution again called upon the members of the Conference on Disarmament at its 1989 session to establish an *ad hoc* committee for the multilateral negotiation of such a treaty and recommended the creation of CD working groups to deal with the contents and scope of such a treaty, and with compliance and verification. The First Committee adopted this resolution on November 15 by a vote of 118 to 3 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions, and the plenary followed suit on December 7 by a vote of 136 to 4 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. (Resolution 43/63 A.)

On October 31, Mexico, along with six cosponsors, introduced a second resolution under the same title as the first one (A/C.1/43/L. 23). After recalling in its preamble the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as other international calls for measures to end the nuclear-arms race, and citing the procedure in Article II of the LTBT for its amendment, the resolution welcomed the submission to the Depository Governments of the LTBT (United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R.) of a proposal to call a conference to amend the Treaty into one entailing a comprehensive test ban. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 15 by a vote of 108 to 3 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions, and in the plenary on December 7 by a vote of 127 to 3 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions. (Resolution 43/63 B.)

The U.S. explanation of vote on this resolution was as follows:

> As we have stated in the past, the United States does not believe that a conference to amend the Limited Test Ban Treaty is an appropriate or practical approach to the subject of a complete test ban. We have expressed our view again in our vote on resolution L. 23. However, we wish to state clearly that the United States will carry out its responsibilities as a depository state in regard to official requests for such a conference.

A third resolution entitled "Urgent Need for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty," was introduced by Australia and New Zealand, along with 36 other cosponsors, on October 31. Reaffirming that a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-test explosions was "a matter of fundamental importance," the text urged the Conference on Disarmament to "initiate substantive work on all aspects of a nuclear-test-ban treaty at the beginning of its 1989 session," and called upon the nuclear-weapon states to "agree to appropriate, verifiable and militarily significant interim measures" to help promote the conclusion of such a treaty. In addition, the resolution urged the CD to take steps to establish an international seismic monitoring network to assist in monitoring and verifying compliance with a test-ban treaty, taking into account progress achieved by the Group of Scientific Experts (GSE). The draft was approved in the First Committee on November 15 by a vote of 127 to 2 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions, and adopted in the plenary on December 7 by a vote of 146 to 2 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 43/64.)

Following the First Committee vote, the U.S. Delegation explained its negative vote on resolutions 43/63 B and 43/64 (both dealing with nuclear testing) as follows:

> The United States was unable to support resolution L. 13 [43/63 B] because it is in fundamental conflict with U.S. policy regarding nuclear testing limitations which we have stated here on several occasions . . .
>
> We also had to vote against L. 51 [Resolution 43/64] . . . because it is, in some respects, also in conflict with U.S. policy. We regret this very much because the sponsors have worked closely and constructively with the United States in trying to resolve those differences.
>
> Mr. Chairman, progress has been made in the past year on reduction of nuclear arms as a result of the constructive negotiating being conducted between the United States and the Soviet Union. We have had the signing of the INF Treaty, and we have made progress toward a strategic arms agreement. We have completed a joint verification experiment, and talks continue toward ratification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty. We appreciate the recognition of this progress offered in preambular paragraphs 4 and 5 of resolution L. 51.

CUT-OFF OF FISSIONABLE MATERIAL FOR WEAPONS PURPOSES

On October 31, along with 20 other cosponsors, Canada introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution entitled, "Prohibition of the Production of

Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes." The resolution was similar to others introduced by Canada in previous years. It considered that the "cessation of production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons . . . would be a significant step towards halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race" and that the "prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices would be an important measure" in helping prevent nuclear proliferation. It requested the Conference on Disarmament to pursue its consideration of the "adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices."

The First Committee approved the resolution on November 11 by a vote of 126 to 1, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions. On December 7 it was adopted by the General Assembly plenary by a vote of 144 to 1, with 7 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States abstained on this resolution because the United States does not consider it realistic to pursue such negotiations in the near term in part due to the extreme difficulty of verifying a cutoff in the production of such materials. (Resolution 43/75 K.)

WORLD DISARMAMENT CAMPAIGN

The World Disarmament Campaign is a Mexican initiative, stemming from the Final Document of the First Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that calls for "mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament." The United States expressed two principal concerns when the campaign was first proposed in 1980. First, we had serious doubts that the Soviet Union and other totalitarian governments would permit any free discussion of international security or disarmament issues. Second, we noted that it was not the function of the United Nations or of governments in democratic societies to mobilize public opinion.

In 1982, at the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, the United States joined in a consensus adopting a plan for a World Disarmament Campaign. The campaign would be carried out "in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner." The United States has made clear its expectation that the campaign would be financed out of existing funds and voluntary contributions, and not through any increase in the UN assessed budget. Pursuant to resolution 42/39 G of 1987, the First Committee held a fifth pledging conference for the campaign on October 27, 1988, during the 43rd General Assembly; the United States did not participate.

On October 31 Mexico introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution entitled "World Disarmament Campaign." The resolution, with 14 cosponsors, regretted that many of the states with the largest military expenditures had failed to make financial contributions to the fund for the campaign. It resolved that there should be a seventh pledging conference for the World Disarmament Campaign at the 44th General Assembly. Finally, it requested the Secretary General, in carrying out the activities of the campaign contemplated for 1988, "to give particular attention to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament."

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 14 by a vote of 128 to 0, with 10 abstentions (U.S.). The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 7 by a vote of 144 to 8, with 10 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 43/76 C.)

Following the First Committee vote, the U.S. Delegation explained its abstention on the resolution as follows:

> We would first note that, with the exception of operative paragraph four, which is inaccurate and inappropriate, the tone of the resolution is more temperate and businesslike than its predecessors, and we commend the drafters for this improvement. Operative paragraph four is inaccurate because most of the states which have the largest military expenditures do indeed make financial contributions to the World Disarmament Campaign through their UN assessed contributions. That paragraph is inappropriate because, by definition, voluntary contributions cannot be contributions made under duress, and language applying such pressure should not appear in a UN resolution. Regrettably, we must abstain on this resolution because of its financial implications, as well as the paragraph I previously mentioned. Under the decision taken by the Second Special Session on Disarmament, the Campaign was to be financed solely from voluntary contributions. A substantial part of the funding of this campaign now comes from UN assessed contributions.

REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS

Romania's traditional resolution, introduced on October 31 by 8 cosponsors and revised on November 11, reaffirmed concern over increasing military expenditures and appealed to all states, pending the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditures, "to exercise self-restraint in their military expenditures with a view to reallocating the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries." As in previous years, the resolution called on the UN Disarmament Commission to conclude its efforts at its 1989 session to agree on a set of principles that would govern the actions of states on the freezing and reduction of military budgets.

The First Committee approved this draft resolution on November 14 without a vote, and it was similarly adopted by the General Assembly plenary on December 7. (Resolution 43/73.) The United States explained its vote as follows:

> Our Delegation has joined consensus on this resolution, but we deem it necessary to state our position on the status of deliberations on reduction of military budgets in the UN Disarmament Commission. During this year's session of the UNDC, much progress was made on this agenda item. Our Delegation was pleased to see that discussions indicate that differences are not as great as they once were. Although deliberations have focused on paragraph seven, our Delegation has consistently pointed out that nothing is agreed until all is agreed, and that even when agreement is reached on this paragraph, the working group will need to review the list of principles in its entirety to insure that as a whole it reflects the consensus of all states.

NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

"Weapons of mass destruction" have long been defined as nuclear weapons, radiological weapons, chemical and biological weapons, and "any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect."

In 1975 the Soviet Union tabled a draft treaty in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) (the predecessor body to the Conference on Disarmament) to ban new weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, the Soviet Union was also the principal sponsor in the General Assembly of a resolution calling on the CCD to undertake negotiations on this treaty. In subsequent years the Soviet Union and its allies have continued to call for such negotiations in resolutions presented at both the CD and the General Assembly.

The U.S. position, shared by many of its allies, is that for an agreement to be effective and verifiable it must address specific weapons as they emerge, rather than treat unknown weapons in general terms. A treaty as proposed by the Soviet Union would be purely hortatory and would depend solely on good faith, a conceptual approach rejected by the United States and other countries.

On October 31 the Byelorussian S.S.R. introduced a draft resolution entitled, "Prohibition of the Development and Manufacture of New Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction and New Systems of Such Weapons." A revised draft was submitted November 14 with 21 cosponsors, and a further oral revision was announced November 16. The final resolution reaffirmed that "effective measures should be taken to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction." It requested the CD, in the light of its existing priorities, to keep the question under review and to make recommendations, when necessary, on undertaking specific negotiations on the identified types of such weapons. It called upon all states to give favorable consideration to such recommendations and requested the CD to submit a report to the 44th General Assembly.

The First Committee approved the resolution on November 18 by a vote of 108 to 0, with 2 abstentions (U.S.). It was adopted in plenary on December 7 by a vote of 152 to 0, with 2 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 43/72.)

NEGATIVE SECURITY ASSURANCES

Non-nuclear-weapon states have long sought guarantees from the nuclear-weapon states that, in exchange for their renunciation of nuclear arms, the nuclear-weapon states would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. These guarantees have been referred to as "negative security assurances." During the first special session on Disarmament in 1978, each of the five nuclear-weapon states, in an effort to meet the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon states, issued a unilateral statement offering some form of negative security assurance. Then Secretary of State Vance made the following statement on behalf of the President (since reiterated by President Reagan):

> The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its territories or armed forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a nuclear-weapon state or associated with a nuclear-weapon state in carrying out or sustaining the attack.

Since 1980 an *ad hoc* committee has addressed the question of negative security assurances at the Conference on Disarmament. It has, however, been unable to reach agreement on effective international arrangements.

The United States is a signatory to Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which is intended to provide security assurances by nuclear-weapon states to members of the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone. While pointing out that the U.S. assurances stand as a reliable and valid statement of U.S. policy, the United States has also indicated its willingness to discuss the possibility of developing a common form of negative security assurance that would both safeguard the security requirements of each of the nuclear-weapon states and their respective allies, and meet the desires of all non-nuclear-weapon states.

As in previous years, Pakistan and Bulgaria each sponsored resolutions on negative security assurances in the First Committee at the 43rd General Assembly. The Pakistani resolution, introduced on October 31 and entitled, "Conclusion of Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons," was essentially along lines similar to its drafts of previous years. It reaffirmed "the urgent need to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." The resolution appealed to all states, especially the nuclear-weapon states, to demonstrate "political will" to reach agreement on a "common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character." In addition, the Pakistani text recommended that the Conference on Disarmament actively continue negotiations toward reaching such an agreement on negative security assurances.

The United States abstained on Pakistan's resolution, on the grounds that the feasibility of reaching effective international arrangements depended on more than just the political will of states. On November 10 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 133 to 0, with 4 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary on December 7 adopted the resolution by a vote of 152 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 43/69.)

Bulgaria's resolution, cosponsored by six other allied states and introduced on October 31, differed from the Pakistani text in that it placed "nuclear states having no nuclear weapons on their territories" in the category of those states entitled to "unconditional international legal assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons," and implicitly excluded any states whose allies (e.g. the Federal Republic of Germany) place nuclear weapons on their territory. The text also requested that the Conference on Disarmament continue active negotiations on this subject and that an *Ad Hoc* Committee be reestablished at the beginning of the 1989 session to promote such negotiations.

The Bulgarian resolution endorsed a number of concepts, such as non-first-use of nuclear weapons, or placing allied countries where nuclear weapons are stationed in a legally less protected category than those where such weapons are not placed. These concepts run contrary to U.S. deterrence policies; therefore, the United States voted against the resolution. The draft resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 99 to 17 (U.S.), with 16 abstentions. On December 7, the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 117 to 17 (U.S.), with 16 abstentions. (Resolution 43/68.)

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF DISARMAMENT

For nearly 10 years, an *ad hoc* committee of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has been negotiating a draft document on a Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD). Each year, the General Assembly has, in its turn, adopted by consensus a Mexican resolution on the CPD.

At the 41st General Assembly, Mexico introduced in the First Committee a draft decision"by which the CPD agenda item would be kept open "in order to allow the Conference on Disarmament to conclude the elaboration of a comprehensive program of disarmament during the first part of its 1987 session and to submit a complete draft of the program to the (41st) General Assembly at that time." The First Committee and the plenary adopted this decision without a vote.

By the time of the 42nd General Assembly, the CD had not yet completed its work on the CPD. Mexico again took the lead in introducing a resolution on this subject in the First Committee. It regretted that the Conference on Disarmament was unable to complete the elaboration of the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament in time to submit a finished draft to the General Assembly prior to the conclusion of its 41st session. The resolution urged the CD to resume its work on the CPD at the outset of its 1988 session, "with a view to resolving outstanding issues," so that the Conference could submit a completed draft to the General Assembly at its Third Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD III). At the 43rd General Assembly, Mexico submitted its draft resolution on the subject on October 31. Recalling the previous year's resolution urging the CD to resume work on the CPD at the outset of its 1988 session, and having examined the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the CPD, and noting the Committee's agreement that it should resume its work at the outset of the 1989 session of the CD with the "firm intention" of completing the elaboration of the program in time for submission to the 44th General Assembly, the resolution took no other action and inscribed the item on the provisional agenda of the 44th General Assembly.

The Mexican resolution was adopted by the First Committee on October 31 and by the General Assembly plenary on December 7, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 43/78 K.)

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) dates back to the 1950's. The United States supports the NWFZ concept as a nonproliferation measure when such a zone would effectively promote regional stability and global security but opposes zones which would erode nuclear deterrence or erode existing security arrangements.

PROTOCOL I OF THE TREATY OF TLATELOLCO

The most significant NWFZ agreement to date is the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which entered into force in 1968 and which, coupled with its two protocols, provides for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. Protocol I, which is open to adherence by non-Latin American states that administer territory within the over 7.5 million-square-mile area, provides that these states will not store or deploy nuclear weapons within those territories. Protocol II, which is open to adherence by nuclear-weapon states, provides that these states will not contribute to acts involving a violation of the Treaty. The United States signed Protocol I in May 1977, and ratified it in November 1981. The United States signed Protocol II in April 1968, and ratified it in May 1971. This treaty and Additional Protocol I, in particular, have been the subject of a series of UN resolutions urging ratification by all concerned states.

On October 31 Mexico (and 14 cosponsors) tabled its traditional resolution in the First Committee concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Cosponsored by 12 Latin American nations, the resolution recognized that there are some territories which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits derived from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the four states that *de jure* or *de facto* are internationally responsible for those territories may become parties. It recalled that three of those states, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States, became parties to Additional Protocol I in 1969, 1971 and 1981, respectively. Deploring the fact that France has not yet ratified the Protocol, the resolution once again urged France to do so without delay.

The First Committee approved Mexico's resolution on November 9 by a vote of 128 (U.S.) to 0, with 6 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 7 by a vote of 149 (U.S.) to 0, with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 43/62.)

While supporting the Treaty of Tlatelolco and a party to its two protocols, the United States is of the view that the resolution should not focus exclusively on Protocol I but rather on the Treaty itself. Accordingly, following the First Committee vote, U.S. Ambassador Max Friedersdorf explained that, while the United States joined consensus on the draft resolution, it did so with certain reservations:

> . . . At the same time, we wish to record once again our disappointment that the draft resolution focuses on Protocol I of the Treaty and not on the issue of universal adherence to the Treaty by all eligible states. In doing so, the draft resolution singles out one state for criticism rather than calling, as it should, on those other eligible states to become parties. Such a discriminatory draft resolution that attacks only part of the problem loses much of its potential force and is less likely to achieve its intended result.
>
> As we have pointed out in the past, only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco, together with its Protocols, is fully in force for all eligible states will it be able to make its full contribution to regional and international security. We therefore urge its sponsors to consider altering their approach should they decide to introduce a draft resolution concerning this Treaty in the future.

AFRICAN NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE

Since 1961 resolutions have been introduced in the First Committee calling for the designation of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and condemning South Africa for allegedly impeding this objective. In 1988 two resolutions were once again introduced in the First Committee concerning nuclear issues and Africa. The first resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration (on the Denuclearization of Africa)," was introduced by Tanzania on October 30 on behalf of the OAU. The resolution regretted the inability of the UN Disarmament Commission to reach consensus on the question of South Africa's nuclear capability and called upon all states to respect the continent and its surrounding areas as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It expressed "grave alarm at South Africa's possession and continued development of nuclear-weapon capability" and condemned it for these actions. The resolution demanded that South Africa submit its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and appealed "to all states that have the means to do so to monitor South Africa's research on and development and production of nuclear weapons and to publicize any information in that regard." Finally, it requested the Secretary General to assist the Organization of African Unity in its efforts to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

After an oral amendment was offered November 17 which removed language urging the withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan soil (such troops had already been withdrawn) but substituted language condemning South Africa for its "constant encroachment" into Angolan territory, the draft resolution was approved by the First Committee that day by a vote of 132 to 0, with 4 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 7, by a vote of 151 to 0, with 4 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States abstained on this resolution because, among other reasons, of its presumption that South Africa possesses a nuclear weapons capability. (Resolution 43/71 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "Nuclear Capability of South Africa," also was introduced by Tanzania on October 30. Its preamble expressed disappointment that "certain Western states and Israel" have continued to collaborate with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields and have "frustrated" Security Council efforts to "deal decisively" with the question through the use of the veto. The resolution condemned

> . . . all forms of nuclear collaboration by any State, corporation, institution or individual with the racist regime of South Africa, in particular the decision by some member states to grant licenses to several corporations in their territories to provide equipment and technical and maintenance services for nuclear installations in South Africa.

It commended those governments which have taken measures to restrict cooperation with South Africa in nuclear and other fields. It demanded an end to exploitation of uranium resources in Namibia, requested the Disarmament Commission to consider South Africa's nuclear capability at its 1989 session, and demanded that South Africa submit its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 9, by a vote of 116 to 4 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. The plenary adopted the resolution on December 7, by a recorded vote of 138 to 4 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. The United States voted against this resolution because of its reference to "certain Western States and Israel" purportedly engaging in military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. (Resolution 43/71 B.)

MIDDLE EAST NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE

As it had done at previous General Assemblies, Egypt, as is traditional, introduced a resolution on "Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Region of the Middle East" in the First Committee on October 28. The resolution—revised from one which had been introduced in past years—thanked the Secretary General for his report on the views of parties concerned regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, and requested for the first time that he undertake a study, over a 2-year period, with the assistance of a small number of consultants, on the practical measures capable of creating the necessary conditions to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, and to submit the study to the 45th session of the General Assembly. A revised version submitted November 9 brought the text closer to resolutions of past years; while including the call for a study, it invited "the countries concerned to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-

Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" (NPT) and called upon all countries of the region to place all their nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. It also invited countries of the region, pending establishment of the zone, "not to develop, produce, test or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or permit the stationing on their territories, or territories under their control, of nuclear weapons or nuclear explosives devices." Finally, the resolution invited the nuclear-weapon states "to refrain from any action that runs counter to both the letter and spirit" of the resolution.

The United States has supported this resolution since it was first introduced in 1974. It was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on November 15; the General Assembly plenary also adopted it without a vote on December 7. (Resolution 43/65.)

Following the Committee's action, U.S. Ambassador Max Friedersdorf delivered the following explanation of the U.S. position on this resolution:

> The U.S. Delegation has joined in support of [the] draft resolution . . . concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. With regard to the fifth preambular paragraph, addressing the need for appropriate measures for the protection of nuclear facilities, this issue . . . is currently under consideration by the Conference on Disarmament, and the United States has not determined that additional measures are required. Moreover, nuclear facilities are already protected by the provisions of the UN Charter and the laws and customs of armed conflict . . .

SOUTH ASIAN NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE

This traditional Pakistani resolution dates back to 1974. Pakistan's text in 1988, introduced on October 28 and cosponsored by Bangladesh, was along lines similar to those of previous years. It reaffirmed endorsement of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and urged the states of South Asia to continue efforts toward its establishment. Additionally, the resolution requested states in the region to avoid actions contrary to this objective and called for the Secretary General to communicate with interested states to ascertain their views in order to further efforts to establish such a zone. It also requested the Secretary General to report on the subject to the 44th session of the General Assembly.

The United States has traditionally supported this resolution. It was adopted by the First Committee on November 15 by a vote of 99 (U.S.) to 2, with 32 abstentions and by the General Assembly on December 7 by a vote of 116 (U.S.) to 3, with 34 abstentions. (Resolution 43/66.) In an explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative offered the following position on nuclear weapon-free zones in general and this resolution in particular:

> The U.S. Delegation has joined in support again this year of the traditional resolution concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, L.5. I would like to recall our basic approach to the establishment of such zones: the initiative should come from states in the region concerned; all states whose participation is deemed important should participate; there should be adequate verification provisions; the zone

> should not upset existing security arrangements to the detriment of regional and international security; it should effectively prohibit nuclear explosive development or possession for any purpose; it should not restrain the exercise of such rights as freedom of navigation; and it should not affect the rights of states to make arrangements for such matters as port calls and transit privileges.

He ended, however, with the following caveat:

> . . . It is clear that there are other areas in which the conditions necessary for a nuclear-weapon-free zone would not be satisfied, such as areas within the NATO region. Accordingly, our Delegation wishes to note the reference in the preambular paragraph three to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world does not constitute for us an endorsement of such zones on a universal basis.

Indian Ocean Zone of Peace

UN General Assembly resolution 2832 (1971), which contained a Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a "zone of peace," (IOZP) called for the great powers to remove their naval forces and facilities from the Indian Ocean. Subsequent annual resolutions endorsed the 1971 Declaration and established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean* to consider its implementation. The United States has made clear from the beginning its reservations about the 1971 terms of reference for the deliberations concerning the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

In 1980 the United States, together with other permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime nations, accepted the invitation of littoral and hinterland states of the region to join the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Since that time, we have attempted to point out the anomaly of trying to restrict naval forces in the region while ignoring land-based forces, such as those of the Soviet Union that had long occupied Afghanistan, a hinterland state of the Indian Ocean. We also have consistently opposed the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean until there were indications that it could be successful. As long as there is no agreement on the basic principles that should govern an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, the United States believes that such a conference would be premature.

During First Committee consideration of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace at the 38th General Assembly, the traditional consensus procedure for dealing with this item was broken when the Eastern states called for a roll-call vote on two operative paragraphs of the Indian Ocean resolution. The United States then made it clear that it would abstain from participation in the *Ad Hoc*

---

*Its 49 members in 1988 were Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Yemen (Aden), Yemen (Sanaa), Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Committee until the consensus procedure was reestablished. Following consultations with members, the committee chairman stated during the July 1984 session that "all delegations have agreed that decisions in matters affecting the Indian Ocean are taken by consensus." On this understanding, the United States took its seat again and has participated in *Ad Hoc* Committee meetings since 1984.

On November 3, Sri Lanka, as chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution which the *Ad Hoc* Committee had adopted by consensus in July.

After renewing the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, it also requested the Committee to hold two preparatory sessions during the first half of 1989, the first for a 1-week and the second for a 2-week period for completion of the remaining preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean to enable the convening of a conference at Colombo in 1990. The Committee also approved updating a compilation of members' views on the IOZP issue, to be submitted by February 1, 1989. This draft resolution was approved without a vote in the First Committee on November 10, and adopted in a similar manner by the Assembly plenary on December 7. While the United States participates in the work of the Committee and supports the general objectives of the IOZP, it has cautioned against the view that the convening of an IOZP Conference and its formal promulgation of an IOZP declaration would automatically solve the security problems of the area, and has recalled the importance of principles of international law, including free access to international waters for all. (Resolution 43/79.)

South Atlantic Zone of Peace

At the 41st General Assembly in 1986, Brazil and a number of African and Latin American cosponsors introduced for the first time a resolution in the Assembly plenary, without reference to a main Committee, calling for the declaration of a "Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic," to be established "in the region situated between Africa and South America." The text called upon all states, "in particular the militarily significant ones," to respect the zone, "especially through the reduction and eventual elimination of their military presence there, the nonintroduction of nuclear weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction, and the nonextension into the region of rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to it." The resolution also affirmed that the elimination of apartheid and the independence of Namibia were essential for peace and security in the South Atlantic region, and urged the implementation of all UN resolutions dealing with apartheid.

The South Atlantic resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 124 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. The United States opposed this resolution for a variety of reasons. Primary among these was its implication that restrictions should be placed on naval access to and activity in the South

Atlantic Ocean. The United States regards such restrictions as being inconsistent with the generally recognized principles under international law of the freedom of navigation on the high seas and the right of innocent passage through territorial waters. At the 42nd General Assembly in 1987, a further resolution on the subject was passed which called on states to help implement the declaration and to refrain from any actions inconsistent with it.

At the 43rd General Assembly, Brazil again took the lead in introducing in the General Assembly plenary on November 10 a draft resolution on this subject. Largely procedural in nature, the text recalled the resolutions adopted in 1986 and 1987. It noted "with appreciation" efforts made by states to fulfill the goals of the declaration, welcomed the holding of the first meeting of States of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic in Rio de Janeiro from July 25–29, 1988; called upon states to cooperate in promoting the objectives of the zone and to refrain from actions inconsistent with them; requested assistance from UN organs in implementing the declaration, and asked the Secretary General to submit a report to the 44th General Assembly on the implementation of the declaration. On November 14 the plenary adopted the Brazilian resolution by a vote of 124 to 1 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 43/23.)

In explaining the negative U.S. vote, U.S. Alternate Representative Noel Gross stated:

> . . . our opposition is based on the view that such a resolution would be inconsistent with the generally recognized principles under international law of the freedom of navigation of the high seas and the right of innocent passage through territorial waters. The United States cannot accept such restrictions. In addition, we believe that any attempt to establish an internationally-recognized zone of peace should be made through multilateral negotiations among relevant parties rather than through a General Assembly resolution.

Israeli Nuclear Armament

As it had done in previous General Assemblies, Iraq on October 28 introduced a resolution in the First Committee entitled, "Israeli Nuclear Armament," cosponsored by 19 Arab and Islamic states. Consistent with the text of previous years' resolutions on this subject, the resolution condemned Israel's refusal to renounce its alleged possession of nuclear weapons and requested the Security Council to take urgent and effective measures to ensure that Israel complied with Security Council resolution 487 (1981), and placed all of its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. It expressed concern over Israel's alleged "policy of attacking and destroying nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes" (preambular paragraph nine), and called on states and organizations to discontinue cooperation with Israel in the nuclear field (operative paragraph five). It also condemned purported nuclear cooperation between Israel and South Africa (operative paragraph two), and requested the IAEA "to suspend any scientific cooperation with Israel which could contribute to its nuclear capabilities" (operative paragraph six).

On November 15 the First Committee approved the Iraqi resolution by a vote of 87 to 2 (U.S.), with 45 abstentions, and the Assembly plenary adopted it on December 7 by a vote of 99 to 2 (U.S.), with 51 abstentions. (Resolution 43/80.)

The United States objected to the overall thrust of this resolution, and especially its appeal to the IAEA to suspend nuclear cooperation with Israel. In the December 7 plenary consideration of the resolution, separate votes were taken on four of its paragraphs. On preambular paragraph six, which recalled a resolution of the 1988 IAEA General Conference condemning Israeli refusal to renounce the possession of nuclear weapons and to submit its nuclear facilities to IAEA safeguards, the Assembly approved retaining the paragraph by a vote of 90 to 19 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions. Separate votes were also taken on preambular paragraph nine, which was retained by 78 to 21 (U.S.), with 42 abstentions; on operative paragraph two, which was retained by 91 to 19 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions; on operative paragraph five, which was retained by 82 to 24 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions; and on operative paragraph six, which was retained by a vote of 81 to 23 (U.S.), with 39 abstentions.

Verification and Compliance

The United States has long maintained that arms control agreements are meaningless if signatories do not live up to the obligations that they have undertaken. The United States, therefore, has placed special emphasis on effective and appropriate verification and compliance provisions in arms control agreements under negotiation and on ensuring that agreements in force are being complied with fully. The United States has sought to gain broad international acceptance of the importance of these concepts of verification and compliance in UN disarmament fora. On the other hand, the United States has generally believed that verification can best be arranged by parties to specific disarmament agreements and has doubted the usefulness or validity of establishing a general UN mechanism to observe compliance with agreements. We have regularly stated that any UN role in verifying compliance with a specific disarmament agreement must be developed and agreed upon by the parties negotiating the agreement.

At the 43rd General Assembly, two draft resolutions on the subject of verification were initially introduced. The first was a Canadian draft that noted the "critical importance" of verification of and compliance with arms control agreements, and that those agreements should provide for the participation of parties directly or through UN organs in the verification process. It urged member states possessing verification expertise to contribute to the inclusion of adequate and effective verification measures in arms limitation and disarmament agreements. More specifically, it requested the

best copy available

Secretary General, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts, to undertake a study of the UN role in verification which would review existing UN activities in the field, assess the need for improvements in existing activities, and provide recommendations for future UN action.

A second draft resolution was introduced by Sweden, along with Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico and Tanzania, its partners in the Six Nation Initiative. It was quite similar to the Canadian draft, but included an endorsement of the principle of a multilateral verification system within the United Nations as an "integral part of a strengthened multilateral framework required to ensure peace and security during the process of disarmament and in a nuclear-free world." The request for a study used identical language to the Canadian draft, with the additional injunction that recommendations be made regarding the implementation of a multilateral verification system.

A merged draft resolution was introduced encompassing elements from both drafts on November 16. It stated that the United Nations can make a "significant contribution" in the field of verification, particularly of multilateral agreements. It provided for a study of the UN role in verification, using the language of the original Canadian draft. The new draft, which had 36 cosponsors, was approved by the First Committee on November 18 by a vote of 130 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions. The resolution was approved by the plenary on December 7 by a margin of 150 to 1 (U.S.), again with no abstentions. (Resolution 43/81 B.) The United States felt compelled to vote against the resolution because it did not provide that any recommendations would be presented only on a consensus basis. The United States also believes that verification arrangements cannot be predetermined but can only be agreed to by parties to a specific arms control treaty.

In his explanation of vote on the verification resolution, U.S. Ambassador Max Friedersdorf said the following:

> The United States has always been firmly of the view that effective verification arrangements are an essential requirement if arms limitation and disarmament are to be real, viable instruments for enhancing security, international stability and peace. We are therefore gratified that this view is now shared by practically the entire international community, including those with a long record of opposing it.
>
> . . . At the same time, we have great difficulties with [this] draft resolution. The position of the United States is that any verification arrangements, including those that might provide for a UN role, must be developed and agreed upon by the negotiating parties. We do not therefore see how the Secretary General can undertake an in-depth study of the role of the United Nations in the field of verification in the abstract, in the absence of any parameters that specific agreements might provide for such a role in individual cases.

On October 31 the United States introduced a resolution on "Compliance With Arms Limitation and Disarmament Agreements," which followed up on a similar resolution it had presented the previous year. (Resolution 42/38 M.) The resolution began by noting the importance of respecting the UN Charter, treaties and other sources of international law, taking note in particular "of the fundamental importance of full implementation and strict observance of agreements on arms limitation and disarmament if individual nations and the international community are to derive enhanced security from them." It stressed that violations of such agreements thus affected the security of parties and others, and that the weakening of confidence in these agreements diminished their contribution to stability and further disarmament efforts and was therefore a matter of concern to the international community. The operative paragraphs of the U.S. resolution urged states "to implement and comply with the entirety of the provisions" of arms limitation and disarmament agreements to which they were parties and called on all member states to give serious consideration to the implications of non-compliance. The resolution appealed to states to support efforts to resolve questions of non-compliance in order to maintain the integrity of arms control agreements and requested the Secretary General to assist member states in this regard. As in 1987, the U.S. resolution on compliance, which attracted 35 cosponsoring nations, was adopted without a vote in the First Committee and the Assembly plenary, on November 18 and December 7, respectively. (Resolution 43/81 A.)

Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space

At the 43rd General Assembly, four draft resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on the subject of outer-space arms control. The draft from the Soviet Union called for the creation of a "world space organization" (as did the Soviet text in 1987), called for strict adherence to the ABM Treaty, and endorsed the proposal for an international verification inspectorate to ensure the peaceful uses of outer space. China tabled a draft critical of the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations on outer-space arms control, while Italy, on behalf of the Western states, presented a resolution offering Western views on the issue. Ultimately, all three of these resolutions were withdrawn, and a fourth resolution, introduced by Egypt and Sri Lanka on behalf of 15 non-aligned countries, was voted upon by the Committee.

Drafted along lines similar to the corresponding text of 1987 resolution 42/33, the Egyptian-Sri Lankan resolution once again requested the Conference on Disarmament to establish an *ad hoc* committee at its 1989 session "with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements . . . to prevent an arms race in outer space" (operative paragraph eight). A revised draft resolution cosponsored by 29 states was tabled on November 17 and was approved by the First Committee that day by a vote of 137 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on December 7 by a vote of 154 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions. (Resolution 43/70.)

The United States objected in particular to operative paragraph eight of the resolution because the United States does not believe there is a basis for multilateral negotiations on outer-space arms control at this time, and called for a separate vote on it in the Assembly plenary on December 7. The paragraph was approved by a vote of 139 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. Because of U.S. opposition to paragraph eight, and because of implicit criticism elsewhere in the text of the Strategic Defense Initiative, the United States voted against the resolution as a whole.

U.S. Representative Ambassador Max Friedersdorf explained the U.S. vote in the following terms:

> There should be no doubt about the U.S. commitment to arms control in this area. Continuing bilateral nuclear and space talks between the United States and the Soviet Union are firm and positive evidence of it. The United States would like nothing better than to be able to affirm this well-known commitment in this forum. Unfortunately, [this] draft resolution . . . does not permit this option. This resolution has over the years assumed an increasingly exaggerated and hostile posture with elements that are deliberately aimed at, and critical of, fundamental elements of U.S. policy. If we want to develop a draft resolution in this forum that will truly reflect consensus desires on this subject, [this] draft resolution . . . . or its successors will have to be radically restructured.

THIRD SPECIAL SESSION ON DISARMAMENT

The Third Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament (SSOD III) was held in New York from May 31 to June 26, 1988. Previous special sessions of the General Assembly on disarmament took place in 1978 (SSOD I) and 1982 (SSOD II). Special sessions on disarmament resemble meetings of the General Assembly's First Committee in terms of membership (global), function (deliberative) and agenda (arms control disarmament and security); they differ, however, in two important aspects: whereas the First Committee meets annually and adopts resolutions by majority vote (or without a vote), special sessions on disarmament traditionally proceed on the basis of consensus and meet at irregular intervals by decision of the General Assembly. The General Assembly president also serves as president of the SSOD; thus the president of SSOD III was the outgoing president of the 42nd General Assembly (Peter Florin, German Democratic Republic).

SSOD III was preceded by several sessions of a Preparatory Committee which made recommendations on organizational and substantive issues to SSOD III (such as the provisional agenda, the number of subsidiary bodies and the scope of a concluding document). Its chairman (Ambassador Ahmad of Pakistan) also served as chairman of the SSOD III Committee of the Whole which established three working groups: on implementation of past General Assembly resolutions on disarmament; on assessment of developments and trends in the disarmament process; and on the UN role in disarmament. Despite intensive deliberations among delegations from the Western, Eastern and non-aligned states, the three working groups were unable to arrive at agreed recommendations. Consequently, SSOD III ended without reaching consensus on a concluding document.

SSOD III was attended by most UN member and observer states, and was followed closely by many nongovernmental organizations. Secretary of State

George Shultz delivered the major address for the United States in which he outlined the U.S. approach to arms control and disarmament: arms are not the cause but a symptom of international tension; the concept of openness is a cardinal principle, complemented by transparency and confidence-building measures to reduce international tensions. He also stressed the need for parallel progress in regional conflict resolution as well as respect for human rights. Subsequently, the Secretary identified three challenges of proliferation, namely in the areas of chemical weapons, ballistic missiles and nuclear arms, and admonished all participants in SSOD III to meet these challenges in the years to come.

The United States sought a successful outcome to the session and, along with other Western states, worked intensively to arrive at a forward-looking concluding document which identified what unites rather than what divides the international community. However, efforts to reach consensus on a substantive concluding document ultimately foundered on irreconcilable differences, not only between the West and non-aligned states but among the non-aligned themselves. Specifically, issues such as the non-proliferation of nuclear, conventional and chemical weapons, and various regional disputes divided the participants in SSOD III. During the end-game negotiations it became clear that, given the conflicting agendas of various non-aligned states on these issues, a consensus final document was unattainable.

It is important to place the outcome of the special session in perspective: SSOD III was not and could not be a forum for resolving long standing differences; the scope and complexity of many bilateral, regional and multilateral disarmament issues do not lend themselves to easy solutions, but require patient negotiations over an extended period of time. Despite the lack of a concluding document, SSOD III served as a very useful forum for the discussion and sharing of members' views on many important issues of international security.

Furthermore, in assessing the results of SSOD III, it is also important to remember that since the last special session in 1982, a number of important breakthroughs have been achieved in the field of arms control: the signing of the historic INF Treaty, the Stockholm Document on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (incorporating the concept of on-site inspection by right), the opening of U.S.-Soviet nuclear risk reduction centers, discussions on a mandate for new negotiations on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), continued work on a 50 percent reduction of offensive strategic nuclear systems and continuing negotiations toward a global, effective and verifiable chemical weapons ban in the Conference on Disarmament.

Considerable attention has been devoted to the arms control efforts—and oft-cited responsibilities—of the major powers, in particular the nuclear weapon states. Little attention, however, has been devoted to the responsibilities of other countries, for example to the conventional weapons acquisitions (and sales) of certain other countries. It is, after all these kinds of weapons that have been used in the vast number of regional conflicts since the end of the second World War, resulting in a UN estimate of 20 million deaths.

In its resolution 43/77 B, adopted in December 1988, the General Assembly expressed its regret that SSOD III ended without agreement on a concluding document. The resolution also noted the useful contribution of special sessions in reviewing and assessing the results of deliberations and negotiations on disarmament issues, and considered that special sessions can provide a new direction and impetus for these efforts. However, there are no plans at this time for another special session on disarmament. Any decision on that issue would have to be made by the General Assembly in the future.

ANTARCTICA

In resolution 38/77 of December 15, 1983, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare a study on all aspects of Antarctica, taking into account the Antarctic Treaty system and other relevant factors. He was also to seek the views of member states and of those conducting scientific research in Antarctica, and to request assistance from other interested states and specialized agencies, as well as from organizations with scientific or technical information on Antarctica. The resulting report, which was submitted to the General Assembly in October 1984, reviewed a range of activities related to Antarctica without making any major recommendations. On December 17, 1984, General Assembly resolution 39/152 expressed appreciation to the Secretary General for the study, and placed Antarctica on the provisional agenda of the 40th session.

Consideration of Antarctica by the General Assembly at its 40th session led to a regrettable polarization of views on the issue, with a number of non-Antarctic Treaty members pressing for fundamental changes in the Antarctic Treaty system, and Treaty parties rejecting the alleged need for significant alterations in the system. Debate in the First Committee resulted in the adoption of three resolutions by vote for the first time, contrary to the previous consideration of Antarctica under the rule of consensus. Beyond these, Malaysia and other developing states also proposed the establishment of a UN *ad hoc* committee to consider Antarctic issues, but did not press for a vote on this issue.

Prior to the Antarctica votes at the 40th session, Australia announced on behalf of the United States and the other Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties that they viewed the breaking of consensus on this matter with regret because consensus had formed the basis for past cooperation by the parties with non-member states and with the United Nations. Since the Consultative Parties were not prepared to accept attempts to undermine the Antarctic Treaty system, which remains open for accession by all nations, the parties declared they would not participate in voting on Antarctica resolutions in either the

First Committee or the General Assembly plenary until consensus, the only realistic basis for UN consideration of the matter, was restored. Australia further stated on behalf of the Parties that they would suspend their cooperation with the United Nations on Antarctic matters until consensus was achieved again. This course of action continued in the 41st through 43rd sessions.

The solidarity of countries supporting this position was maintained at the 1988 session, although some Antarctic Treaty countries supported the resolution that called for the exclusion of South Africa from the Antarctic Treaty.

Two resolutions on Antarctica were adopted by the 43rd General Assembly. The first expressed the conviction that any minerals regime in Antarctica should be negotiated with the "full participation of all members of the international community" (and not just of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties themselves). It further expressed "deep regret" that the Consultative Parties had adopted on June 8, 1988, a Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities despite General Assembly resolutions to the contrary. In addition, it reiterated the call upon the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary General or his representative to all meetings of the Treaty Parties, including consultative meetings, and requested the Secretary General to submit a report of his evaluation of these meetings to the 44th General Assembly. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 22 by a vote of 77 to 0, with 7 abstentions and 44 (U.S.) not participating in the vote. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on December 7 by a vote of 100 to 0, with 6 abstentions and 46 states (U.S.) not participating. (Resolution 43/83 A.)

The second resolution called upon the Consultative Parties to exclude South Africa from their meetings because of its policy of apartheid. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 22 by a vote of 89 to 0, with 5 abstentions and 22 (U.S.) not participating. It was approved by the plenary on November 30 by a vote of 108 to 0, with 10 abstentions and 31 (U.S.) not participating. (Resolution 43/83 B.)

Prior to the November 22 vote on resolution 43/83 A in the First Committee, Australia, speaking on behalf of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative and Non-Consultative Parties, expressed the Parties' misgivings about the value of debates in the United Nations on the Antarctic Treaty system. Australia rejected the criticisms which have been directed by some UN members at the Treaty, and highlighted the accomplishments of the Treaty system. The Parties found it unfortunate and regrettable that the General Assembly's consideration of Antarctica had departed from the pattern of consensus in recent years. Australia concluded by stating that the Treaty Parties remain willing to display flexibility and to negotiate a return to consensus in the UN's consideration of Antarctica, but not at what the Treaty

Parties regard as the cost of the possible erosion of the successful functioning of the Antarctic Treaty system.

OUTER SPACE

UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

The 53-member UN Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS), its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee and its Legal Subcommittee all met during 1988. For several decades after its inception in 1958, the Committee worked successfully in the exchange of scientific information and negotiated four widely accepted conventions that form the basis of international space law. However, the scientific and legal work of the Committee has deteriorated seriously in recent years with debates becoming increasingly political. There has been a tendency to try to involve the Committee in disarmament and other matters that the United States and other Western states believe are fundamentally at odds with the Committee's mandate and with the consensus procedure that governs its work.

COPUOS met for its 31st session in June. The West continued to press for the adoption of measures to revitalize COPUOS and its subcommittees. To this end, some states accepted a U.S. proposal to add to the COPUOS agenda an item on the secondary applications of space technology for addressing problems on Earth. A Western working paper aimed at strengthening the Committee met with opposition from the Eastern countries. As an alternative, the U.S.S.R. once again proposed setting up a new bureaucratic structure, otherwise known as the World Space Organization (WSO). The United States and other Western countries oppose WSO because it would replicate COPUOS. Rather than establish new international machinery, the United States believes that efforts should be made to strengthen the existing structures.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

In February the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee again considered items first proposed in a working paper sponsored by Australia, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States, in the fields of space science, planetary exploration and astronomy. Largely at the instigation of the West, the Subcommittee focused on the practical applications of remote sensing and satellite communications technologies of particular relevance to developing countries. The Subcommittee also decided to pay particular attention in 1989 to the use of space technology for combatting environmental problems. These were useful steps toward strengthening the scientific content of the Subcommittee's work which will keep member states abreast of knowledge gained in space exploration. A Working Group of the Whole met again to consider improving the execution of activities of the Program on Space Applications and to evaluate the implementation of recommendations of the UNISPACE '82 Conference. Considerable progress was made in focusing attention on measures which will strengthen the existing structure for carrying out the work recommended by the Conference. At the same time, the Subcommittee rejected a proposal by the U.S.S.R. to establish an international space agency which would, in practice, replace the existing COPUOS structure and deal primarily with disarmament issues.

LEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE

The 27th session of the Legal Subcommittee met in Geneva in March. The agenda included the definition and delimitation of outer space, the rational and equitable use of the geostationary orbit and the use of nuclear power sources in space. However, the Subcommittee spent much of its time debating proposals for the addition of a new agenda item dealing with the application of the principle that space exploration should be carried out for the benefit of all countries, taking particular account of the needs of developing countries. The United States and seven other Western countries continued to offer concrete measures to increase the efficiency of the work of the Subcommittee, in view of the consistently widely recognized waste of conference resources by the Subcommittee. The East dismissed these suggestions without making any constructive proposals of their own.

General Assembly Consideration

The 43rd General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, adopted without a vote an omnibus resolution dealing with "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. (Resolution 43/56.) The resolution, as previous resolutions on the same item have done each year, renews COPUOS and sets the agenda for the Committee and its subcommittees.

Ambassador Hugh Montgomery summarized U.S. views on COPUOS as follows:

> . . . We have joined with other delegations in recent years in proposing specific measures to insure that COPUOS functions effectively and efficiently. We are pleased to note that one such proposal was adopted at the last session of COPUOS . . . We should not dwell on ways to duplicate or dismantle the COPUOS structure, but rather, we must seek to strengthen what we have . . . We welcome the growing recognition that an effort to strengthen the working methods of COPUOS and its subcommittees is not something which the United States or other Western governments derive any benefit. Rather, all COPUOS members have a stake in constantly seeking to enhance the efficiency of COPUOS and its subcommittees and to provide for a business-like atmosphere in which scientific and legal experts can work dispassionately to produce legal results . . .

COPUOS marked its 30th anniversary in 1988. In noting that important milestone, Ambassador Montgomery made the following observations:

> . . . It was 30 years ago when the General Assembly adopted resolution 1348 (XIII) [that] established the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and laid the foundation for COPUOS as the only standing body of the General Assembly to consider international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Those nations in the General Assembly in 1958 which supported the resolution had the wisdom to appreciate the practical need for separating disarmament questions relating to outer space from matters of its peaceful use. The First Committee of the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament were then, as they are today, the competent multilateral fora for discussion of disarmament aspects of outer space.

LAW OF THE SEA

The Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea (LOS) was convened in 1972 and completed negotiations on an LOS Treaty at its 11th and final session in the spring of 1982.

After a searching review of the draft treaty and of U.S. participation in the LOS negotiations, the United States decided to participate in the final round of negotiations and attempt to protect U.S. interests by seeking amendments to the seabed-mining section of the draft Convention, which the United States believed to be fundamentally flawed. The United States was unable to obtain essential changes and therefore called for a vote on the Treaty. The vote was 130 to 4 (U.S., Turkey, Israel and Venezuela), with 17 abstentions (principally a combination of EC countries and the Eastern European countries). President Reagan subsequently announced on July 19, 1982, that the United States would not sign the Treaty, and it was later joined in this view by two other major seabed-mining nations—the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The General Assembly adopted resolutions at its 37th through 42nd sessions that welcomed the adoption of the LOS Convention, called on all states to sign and ratify the Convention, and approved financing of the LOS Preparatory Commission from the regular UN budget. Only the United States and Turkey opposed the resolutions. On November 10, 1988, the 43rd General Assembly again endorsed the LOS Convention and approved funds for the Preparatory Committee from the regular UN budget by a vote of 135 to 2 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 43/18.)

In an explanation of vote, U.S. Alternate Representative Noel Gross stated in the Assembly plenary on November 1:

> My Delegation reluctantly has had to cast a negative vote on a resolution concerning the Law of the Sea. The United States . . . views the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea as a major accomplishment in the development of international law relating to the oceans. Unfortunately, the convention contains one part, Part XI, that runs contrary to U.S. policy . . . concerning further development of resources on the deep seabed. Therefore, the United States has not signed the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Nevertheless, we welcome the resolution of the deep seabed mining conflicts which affected the commercial interests of U.S. companies and commend the efforts by the respective parties to effect practical solutions to commercial problems . . . We recognize that it is in the interests of all states to avoid

conflicts over uses of the ocean regardless of their positions with respect to the Law of the Sea Convention.

The United States is opposed to this resolution because it continues funding from the general budget of the United Nations for the Preparatory Commission on the international seabed authority and the international tribunal for the Law of the Sea . . . The costs of the Preparatory Commission should be borne by nations that are party to the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea . . . its costs cannot be assessed against all UN members as part of the UN budget, as they do not represent legitimate "expenses of the organization" within the meaning of Article 17 (2) of the UN Charter. We remain opposed to such improper assessment and are determined to resist such abuses of the UN budget and the UN Charter. Therefore, the United States will continue to withhold its pro rata share of the UN annual assessment from the regular budget that pertains to the funding of the Preparatory Commission or is earmarked to support the implementation of Part XI of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The U.S. position on the legality of exploration and exploitation of deep seabed resources under international law is well known. As we have stated many times, the United States and its nationals, like other states and their nationals, have the legal right to explore and exploit deep seabed resources. Under international law such activities are a lawful exercise of high seas freedoms. The United States and its nationals intend to exercise these rights with reasonable regard to the interests of other states in their exercise of high seas freedoms.

In addition, this year's resolution once again speaks of the unity of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea and calls upon all states to safeguard the unified character of the convention and related resolutions adopted with it. This cannot be understood as a limitation on either the right or duty of all states to act in accordance with those portions of the convention which reflect customary international law.

. . . I wish to emphasize the U.S. view that the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea has many positive aspects. The United States will continue to cooperate with the international community to ensure that the important principles enshrined in parts of the convention, other than Part XI, are widely respected.

GENERAL POLITICAL PROBLEMS

Membership

There were no applications for membership in the United Nations in 1988.

Question of Peacekeeping

PEACEKEEPING COMMITTEE

In 1965 the General Assembly established the 33-member Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (Peacekeeping Committee) to attempt to overcome financial difficulties caused by unpaid peacekeeping assessments and to examine all aspects of future peacekeeping operations. Ever since then the Peacekeeping Committee has been responsible for carrying out a comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations on conceptual and practical levels. Effective December 6, 1988, the committee's membership was increased to 34.*

The Peacekeeping Committee met twice in 1988: on February 10 and August 25. At the first meeting, the Committee decided to hold informal consultations to direct the Committee's work in conformity with its mandate. Six informal sessions of consultations were held between March 30 and August 22. The discussions included consideration of the financial aspects of peacekeeping operations, UN publications on peacekeeping, compiling a registry on the availability of troops and provision of logistical assistance. At its second meeting, the Committee adopted its report to the General Assembly, recommending that its mandate be renewed so that it can continue efforts to complete its work.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The General Assembly's Special Political Committee considered the question of peacekeeping in five meetings October 17 and 25–27 and November 2.

On October 26 U.S. Ambassador Herbert Okun told the Special Political Committee that the demand for new peacekeeping operations in 1988 had led to proposals for change. He recalled the Secretary General's advice that the success of peacekeeping depended not only on the consent of the parties, but also on the consistent support of the Security Council, on a clear and achievable mandate, on the readiness of member states to volunteer troops and on adequate financial arrangements. He added that success also depends on the Secretary General, who should continue to respond flexibly to requirements that vary from operation to operation.

On November 2 the Special Political Committee adopted two draft resolutions sponsored by the members of the Bureau of the Peacekeeping Committee (Argentina, Canada, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Japan and Nigeria) by consensus. (Draft Resolutions A/SPC/43/L.6 and A/SPC/43/L.7.) The first resolution called on the Peacekeeping Committee to continue carrying out a comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations with a view to strengthening the UN role in the field in 1989. It also invited members to submit suggestions to the Secretary General on ways to make peacekeeping operations more effective and requested the Peacekeeping Committee to submit a report to the 44th General Assembly. The second resolution approved China's request to become a member of the Peacekeeping Committee and expanded the Committee's membership to 34. On December 6, the General Assembly adopted both drafts without a vote. (Resolutions 43/159 A and B.)

---

*Members from January 1–December 5, 1988, were: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. China joined the Committee effective December 6, 1988.

Efforts Toward Strengthening the United Nations

CHARTER COMMITTEE

The Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Organization (Charter Committee) held its 13th session in New York, February 22–March 11. The Charter Committee operated through a working group that met in closed meetings and considered the maintenance of international peace and security, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the rationalization of UN procedures. The primary focus, in the context of the maintenance of peace and security, was on draft recommendations concerning preventive diplomacy based on a draft introduced in 1984 sponsored by Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand and Spain. The Charter Committee adopted by consensus a declaration entitled "Declaration on the Prevention and Removal of Disputes and Situations which may Threaten International Peace and Security and on the Role of the United Nations in this Field" (Prevention and Removal of Disputes) which it forwarded with its report on its 1988 session to the 43rd General Assembly via the Sixth Committee.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In seven meetings, October 14–20, and in two meetings, November 4 and 22, the Sixth Committee considered the report of the Charter Committee.

On November 4 Finland introduced a draft resolution (A/C.6/43/L.6) on the Declaration of the Prevention and Removal of Disputes, also sponsored by Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Venezuela and Colombia, which was adopted without a vote.

On October 20 the U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, stated that the draft declaration on the prevention and removal of disputes was the result of a spirit of compromise of all concerned. As such, it lacked certain important elements, while it included other material with which the United States does not entirely agree. The implicit recognition contained in the draft declaration that international security would be enhanced by making efficient use of the available institutions, and not by seeking structural adjustments, is entirely sound, he noted.

On November 22 Egypt introduced a draft resolution (A/C.6/43/L.15), sponsored by 25 states, that was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. On December 9 the General Assembly also adopted the resolution by consensus. The resolution expressed deep appreciation to the Charter Committee for the draft declaration on the prevention and removal of disputes and situations which may threaten international peace and security and the role of the United Nations in this field and submitted it to the 43rd General Assembly for adoption. The resolution requested the Charter Committee to accord priority during its 1989 session to the maintenance of international peace and security and, in particular, proposals concerning fact-finding activities by the United Nations and other proposals which may be submitted relating to the maintenance of peace and international security. It also requested the Committee to continue its work on the peaceful settlement of disputes between states, including completion of its consideration of the proposal for the creation of a permanent commission on good offices, mediation and conciliation. It requested the Secretary General to continue the preparation of a draft handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes and urged the committee to keep the question of the rationalization of UN procedures under constant review. (Resolution 43/170.)

In conjunction with the Charter Committee report, the Sixth Committee considered the item "Peaceful Settlement of Disputes Between States" during seven meetings, October 14–20, and two meetings, November 15 and 21.

On November 15 Romania introduced a draft resolution on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes Between States (A/C.6/43/L.8), sponsored by 53 states, that was adopted November 21 by the committee by a vote of 90 to 0, with 20 abstentions (U.S.). On December 9 the General Assembly adopted the same resolution by a vote of 132 to 0 with 22 abstentions (U.S.). In its explanation of vote before the Committee, the U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, said that the United States abstained because it saw no purpose in a separate resolution since the matter was also being considered by the Charter Committee and the text itself posed a number of difficulties. The resolution urges the observance of the Manila Declaration on Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes, calls for greater use of the UN framework for the peaceful settlement of disputes and enhancement of the effectiveness of the United Nations in this field, and requests a report from the Secretary General on the implementation of the Manila Declaration. (Resolution 43/163.)

Questions Relating to Information

Questions relating to information are discussed at annual sessions of the UN Committee on Information (COI). The COI is a standing committee of the General Assembly mandated to oversee UN public information activities, including those of the UN Department of Public Information (DPI), and to coordinate information activities of UN specialized agencies. It had 70 members during 1988. Each year it adopts a set of recommendations on information issues to submit to the Special Political Committee (SPC) of the General Assembly, which, after discussion, adopts the recommendations in their original or amended form as a resolution.

Because the Group of 77 (G–77) countries enjoy an overwhelming numerical preponderance in COI membership, they have succeeded in establishing their agenda, views and language as the basis for discussion within the Committee. The most active G–77 countries have been those which are least democratic, and the language of the COI recommendations has accordingly reflected views inimical to the principles of free flow of information and freedom of the press. These countries have usually enjoyed the support of the Eastern Europeans in advancing their views. We and our allies have succeeded, however, in gradually moderating this language to reflect Western views on free flow of information and freedom of the press, as incorporated in the UN Charter. We have also succeeded in introducing language calling for greater objectivity in DPI reporting and for more efficient management of DPI. Improvements in the resolutions have not yet been sufficient, however, to gain U.S. or general Western support.

In the weeks before the opening of the annual summer session of the COI in 1988, some of its Bureau members attempted to forestall the usual sterile rhetoric and wrangling that have characterized COI discussions each year. They drafted a brief set of recommendations which they hoped would be adopted by the Bureau and presented to the COI as a Bureau paper. Because all geographical groups are represented in the Bureau, it was anticipated that the recommendations would be acceptable to all. The paper failed, however, to gain the support of either G-77 hardliners or the Western Group and, in the end, was not adopted by the Bureau itself.

During the COI's 10th session, held June 27-July 13, the United States put forward a new formulation in an attempt to resolve what has been the most contentious issue in these discussions. The United States offered to accept inclusion of the phrase "new world information and communication order" (NWICO) in the COI recommendations if it were defined in a way acceptable to us. This new proposed definition acknowledged the need for an increase in media infrastructure in developing countries to narrow the present gap in capabilities, but it also stressed above all that the NWICO concept must not be construed to sanction restrictions on the free flow of information or on freedom of the press. NWICO has been so construed, especially by free press groups, and was explicitly so defined by some of its original proponents.

The U.S. offer made possible the adoption of a common Western position on the issue at the COI. Unity in the Western Group, reflected in presentation of its own set of recommendations and the making of a common statement, strengthened its negotiating position. The result was the drafting of a compromise paper (a working nonpaper) that improved resolution language supporting free flow of information and freedom of the press, reduced the unbalanced agenda favoring Third World and non-aligned goals, reduced political rhetoric and gave added support to rational management and budgetary restraint at DPI.

G-77 moderates (mainly those from countries with a free press and democratic governments) tried to persuade their group's hardliners to accept this compromise paper. The hardliners backed away from doing so, however. Instead, they sought to force a vote on the G-77's original set of recommendations. With the support of the Western Group, the East European Group and China, the G-77 moderates persuaded the hardliners to accept an adjournment of the COI session until early September. It was hoped that the additional time would facilitate an eventual agreement.

The same scenario was repeated at the resumed session held September 8-9: G-77 hardliners balked at accepting the compromise document, tried to force a vote on their own unacceptable recommendations, and were persuaded by their moderates (with Western, East European and Chinese help) to adjourn once more. It was agreed to let all the documents be forwarded to the SPC. As a result, both the proposed Western text and the compromise paper became part of the official record, a plus for the West.

At the SPC session in November, further attempts were made to reach consensus. In the end, however, and despite an increasing realization that adoption of resolutions by force of numbers rather than by consensus is not very helpful to them, the G-77 hardliners reverted to their original language. Unable to accept the compromise text, they reverted to language with which they felt more comfortable. Moreover, they backtracked—on language dealing with free flow of information and on objective and balanced DPI reporting. The result was a resolution that the United States felt compelled once again to vote against. In an explanation of vote, U.S. Alternate Representative Ambassador Hugh Montgomery said the United States will not join consensus on a resolution containing language that can be exploited to justify restrictions on free flow of information or on freedom of the press. He said the United States will continue to undertake practical programs to assist developing countries to increase the human and material resources of the media.

In contrast to the situation during the past 2 years, the United States no longer stood alone in opposition. This time it was not the United States, but G-77 hardliners, who were seen as preventing consensus. Five Western countries, Israel and Japan joined us in voting against the resolution, and every other Western Group country (except Ireland) abstained. The vote, on November 23, was 100 to 8 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. This major shift in voting within the Western Group reflected general dissatisfaction with the reduced emphasis placed on free flow of information and on the need for impartiality and objectivity in DPI reporting, as well as with G-77 inflexibility. Some G-77 countries voted for the resolution only because they felt compelled to show group unity.

The SPC also adopted a resolution on UNESCO information issues. The vote was 111 to 1 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. The United States voted against this resolution because it politicized DPI activities, contained language that called for the establishment of NWICO, and asserted that sovereign equality extends to the field of information (a formulation that is used to justify controls).

In the General Assembly plenary session on December 6, the information resolution was adopted by a vote of 128 to 8 (U.S.), with 16 abstentions. (Resolution 43/60 A.) The UNESCO resolution was adopted by a vote of 141 to 1 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. (Resolution 43/60 B.)

Hungary, Ireland and Zimbabwe were admitted to membership in the COI, bringing the total number to 73.

The United States has long been critical of the lack of objectivity in the materials DPI disseminates. In April 1986 the General Accounting Office (GAO), responding to a request by Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), published a report evaluating DPI printed materials and scripts of its radio programs. The report (GAO/NSIAD-86-98) showed that about half of the products opposed key U.S. interests. It recommended that the Secretary of State develop a review process to better monitor selected UN public information materials. The Department of State initiated review procedures in August 1986 at the U.S. Mission to the UN in New York and instructed all U.S. Embassies in countries where UN Information Centers are located to review the materials the Centers disseminate. These procedures have made DPI more aware of U.S. concerns and more attentive to objectivity and fairness in relation to U.S. interests. The number of occasions upon which the United States is finding it necessary to register concern is decreasing, and the extent and depth of anti-U.S. bias has diminished somewhat. The appointment of a Canadian director of DPI in March 1987, the reorganization she is implementing and the personnel changes she has made have produced a greater willingness to listen to and to heed U.S. complaints and suggestions. These developments give cause for optimism that a further reduction in anti-U.S. bias is possible. The monitoring efforts are continuing.

Part 2

Economic, Social, Scientific and Human Rights Affairs

INTRODUCTION

Chapter III of the UN Charter established the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) as the principal organs of the United Nations responsible for the issues covered in Part 2 of this report. ECOSOC's limited membership (54 countries) has, however, led the developing countries to prefer the General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies where they enjoy their maximum voting strength, for substantive discussion and action on international economic issues, especially those directly related to development. As a result, the General Assembly has created entities (described in this part) for substantive discussion and action on international economic issues, especially those directly related to development. The most important of these is the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies constitute the major fora for what has come to be called the North/South dialogue between developed and developing countries. The North/South distinction between developed and developing countries, however, tends to mask the significant differences within each group and to overlook the high degree of economic interdependence which exists between developed and developing countries and among developing countries themselves. A major area for North/South dialogue is the International Development Strategy (IDS), discussed under its own heading in this part.

The General Assembly, in its regular sessions, is organized into seven committees. The Second Committee is responsible primarily for economic affairs, and the Third Committee for cultural, humanitarian and social affairs.

In 1988 the major issues before the Second Committee were the international debt crisis, a proposal for a special session of the General Assembly to review economic development and growth, and a new

International Development Strategy for the 1990s. Other important issues included the Nicaragua Trade Embargo, operational activities, poverty, natural disaster reduction, AIDS and the environment.

The debt issue was given highest priority by the Group of 77 (G–77) again this year. Despite long and arduous negotiations, the United States was again unable to accept a modified G–77 resolution on this issue because it did not give sufficient importance to the need for structural reform within the developing countries, encouraged a greater role for the Secretary General and General Assembly President in dealing with the problem and impinged upon the IMF and World Bank. The final vote on the resolution was 150 to 1 (U.S.) with one abstention, Japan.

Efforts to reach agreement on convening a special session of the General Assembly to review economic development and growth were unsuccessful and the Second Committee decided to postpone taking a final decision on this issue until it could meet again in a resumed session in February 1989. A preparatory committee has been formed.

Constructive engagement by the United States on development issues in the areas of environment and operational activities resulted in the adoption of a number of resolutions acceptable to the United States. Included among these was a resolution calling for an Environmental Conference in 1992.

The General Assembly decided to establish an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Whole (COW) to prepare a new international development strategy for the Fourth Development Decade for the 1990s. In voting on this issue, the United States abstained because of doubts about the effectiveness of the development decades in contributing to the economic growth of developing countries and about the need to perpetuate this process.

The United States was again faced with a resolution deploring the U.S. trade embargo against Nicaragua. The United States maintained its position that the Second Committee was not the appropriate forum for an issue which was basically political. Despite the U.S. stand, the issue was adopted by a vote of 89 to 2 (U.S.) with 50 abstentions, a slight improvement over 1987.

The Third Committee considered questions on racism, refugees, migrant workers, self-determination, totalitarianism, youth, aging, the disabled, women, crime, narcotics, religious intolerance, torture, the abuse of psychiatry to control political dissidents and other human rights issues. Resolutions were adopted on the human rights situations in Afghanistan, Chile, Iran and El Salvador. The United States sponsored a resolution on the right of individuals to own property which was subsequently adopted. A U.S. initiative on the importance of free elections as a cornerstone to the protection of human rights was also successful. The Third Committee voted to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Second and Third committees receive some of their issues directly, but most are passed to them by ECOSOC. All elements of the UN system primarily concerned with the issues in this section usually report to the General Assembly through ECOSOC. It is authorized only to comment on reports from other bodies before conveying them to the General Assembly.

ECOSOC consists of its plenary body; five regional economic commissions; several functional commissions; and a varying number of subcommissions, working groups and expert groups. The regional economic commissions and many of the other bodies are covered later in this part.

ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

The Critical Economic Situation in Africa

In May 1986 the General Assembly, at the request of the African Group, convened a special session (the 13th special session of the General Assembly) on "The Critical Economic Situation in Africa" at its headquarters in New York. The special session issued a declaration in which the Africans affirmed their commitment to economic reform and the international community gave a political commitment to support their efforts. The declaration's language on major financial and assistance issues closely paralleled stated U.S. policy. The special session also adopted resolution S-13/2 by consensus which contained the UN Program of Action for Economic Recovery and Development 1986–1990 for Africa.

In October 1986 the 41st session of the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 41/29 which noted the special session's Program of Action and urged the international community to render whatever assistance possible.

At the 42nd session of the General Assembly in 1987, the United States joined consensus in adopting resolution 42/163, which established an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Whole of the General Assembly to prepare the review and appraisal of the UN Program of Action prior to the 43rd General Assembly. It further called for the Secretary General to prepare a report including concrete recommendations for full implementation of the Program of Action. The U.S. Representative made a statement emphasizing the importance of the continued commitment of African governments to structural adjustment and domestic policy reform and highlighting the international efforts already underway to help Africa.

The *Ad Hoc* Committee met in New York September 12–24, reviewed progress made in implementing the Program of Action, and concluded that despite commendable efforts by the international community to assist the determined efforts by African governments, the situation in Africa continued to worsen. The Committee called on the international community to continue efforts to reduce the burden of Africa's external debt by supplementing reschedulings by other multilateral and bilateral measures. The *Ad Hoc* Committee's report noted that available data indicated that economic reform was beginning to show a positive impact on economic growth and stressed that appropriate reform policies and programs needed to be vigorously implemented and sustained. It was recommended that African countries make special efforts to increase trade and diversify their economies. The U.S. Representative on the UN Economic and Social Council, Ambassador Lester B. Korn, delivered the U.S. statement and noted that at the 1986 special session, the Africans had accepted responsibility for their own economic future. He called on the Africans to develop realistic and forward-looking policies to resolve the economic crisis. In regard to the U.S. position on African debt Ambassador Korn said, "First, the way U.S. laws work, if we forgive development debts, we have to cover the loss out of current year development funds" and "Second, the notion that the United States holds a lot of development debt is a misperception." He stated that the United States would continue to support Africa through its bilateral assistance programs and through multilateral assistance programs of the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and African Development Bank which promote long-term growth.

The General Assembly considered the critical economic situation in Africa and the implementation of the UN Program of Action for African Recovery and Development on November 18, 1988. Twenty-three members took part in the debate. Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, the U.S. Representative to the General Assembly, expressed support for the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. He described it as a good summary of the economic problems facing Africa, what had been achieved to date, and the need for further concrete action to address Africa's economic and development problems. The Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 43/27 approving the *Ad Hoc* Committee's conclusions and decided to conduct a final review and appraisal of the UN Program of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development in 1991.

Emergency Assistance to Jamaica, Sudan and Countries Affected by Hurricane Joan

Each year, the UN General Assembly usually adopts a number of resolutions calling on member states and UN agencies to assist countries afflicted by natural disasters by whatever means possible. At its 43rd session, the Assembly adopted three such resolutions calling for emergency assistance to Jamaica, Sudan and those countries affected by hurricane Joan. The United States joined consensus in the adoption of these resolutions.

The three resolutions urge all member states to contribute to the relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts in the affected areas and request the United Nations and all of its agencies, as well as the international financial institutions, to assist those countries in mobilizing the additional financial resources necessary for their rehabilitation and reconstruction. These resolutions have no financial implications for the regular UN budget.

International Development Strategy

The International Development Strategy (IDS) for the 1980s was adopted by consensus in 1980 at the 35th session of the UN General Assembly and was intended to provide a blueprint for international economic growth throughout the decade. Although the IDS endorsed many development principles we advocate, it also had significant weaknesses—including overly ambitious and unrealistic growth targets for developing countries in the 1980s, and excessive dependence on official development assistance (ODA) for meeting its goals by calling for donor countries to reach an assistance target of 0.7 percent of GNP. Because of these weaknesses, the United States made a statement of reservation at the time of the adoption of the IDS.

A 1985 system-wide mid-term review of the Third IDS (1980s) contained the first acknowledgment within the United Nations of an improvement in the world economy, and called for the Secretariat to study the implications of different development policies—which can be used to advance policies which have been successful, i.e., reliance on market principles and the private sector.

A resolution adopted at the 42nd General Assembly requested the Secretary General to compile information which could be used in 1988 to reassess the Third IDS and also to begin preparation for a new IDS for the 1990s.

On December 20 the 43rd General Assembly approved a G-77 sponsored resolution establishing an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Whole for the preparation of a new International Development Strategy for the Fourth Development Decade (1990s). The vote on resolution 43/182 was 151 to 0 with one abstention (U.S). In his explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative noted that while the United States had supported the three previous international development strategies, it had serious reservations about their approach and unrealistic goals and targets. He added that the United States continues to believe that the 0.7-percent target of official development assistance is arbitrary and impractical when applied across the board to every donor. Moreover, it is impossible to develop a single development strategy which can be effectively applied to all developing countries. As each country's situation is different, the United States believes that development strategies must be developed on a case-by-case basis, according to each country's specific needs and situation.

Long-Term Trends in Economic Development

The General Assembly first showed an interest in long-term trends and forecasts at its 30th session in 1975. Stating that an examination of long-term trends in the economic development of individual regions was of great importance for securing a rapid rate of economic development of all countries, in particular of developing countries, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare a comprehensive report on long-term trends and forecasts in the economic development of the various regions and their mutual relationship. At its 32nd session, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare an overall socioeconomic perspective of the development of the world economy up to the year 2000. This report was 5 years in preparation and when it appeared in 1982, the United States found it to be unduly pessimistic, biased toward blaming international factors rather than domestic policies for the economic problems of developing countries, while paying insufficient attention to the role of the private sector in development. Nevertheless, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare another comprehensive report for submission in 1985 and wanted to institutionalize the preparation of revised and updated reports every 3 years. The United States opposed this idea, largely because we feel that such reports are better handled by the IMF and the World Bank which possess greater economic expertise than the UN Secretariat.

At its 40th session in 1985 the General Assembly took note of the Secretary General's latest report on the overall socioeconomic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000, and charged him with revising and updating it in time for the 42nd session in 1987—2 years later. The United States opposed the resolution because it contained unacceptable references to the New International Economic Order (NIEO) and to the relationship between disarmament and development. The vote was 144 to 1 (U.S.) with 13 abstentions.

At the resumed 40th session of the General Assembly to consider the financial crisis facing the UN, the General Assembly decided to postpone consideration of the Secretary General's report until the 43rd session of the Assembly.

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, the United States again questioned the utility and relevance of this report. The United States ultimately joined consensus in adopting a resolution which gives the Secretary General greater flexibility in selecting the focus of the report and extends the interval of updates to every 5 years. (Resolution 43/194.)

Economic Commission for Europe

The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), established in 1947, is one of five regional economic commissions which report to ECOSOC. It has 34 members—the European members plus Canada, Switzerland and the United States. Other UN member countries take part, in a consultative capacity, when matters of particular concern to them are considered. Composed largely of developed nations, ECE focuses on problems confronting modern industrialized societies. Decisions are made by consensus reached in deliberations between Eastern and Western caucuses.

ECE's terms of reference are broad and over the years the nature of its work has paralleled changing European and Atlantic concerns. When first established, the ECE's principal focus was on European postwar economic reconstruction. Since then the Commission has evolved into a forum where East and West can consult on economic and technical problems of common interest. The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) specifically accorded the ECE a number of responsibilities for multilateral activity in economics, transportation, science, technology and the environment.

The concluding document of the follow-up meeting of representatives of the participating states of the CSCE signed in Madrid in 1983 reaffirmed the ECE's role as a forum for implementing provisions relating to energy, trade, air pollution and transport.

ECE carries out its activities principally through 15 specialized committees—Agricultural Problems; Chemical Industry; Coal; Electric Power; Gas; Housing, Building and Planning; Inland Transport; Steel; Timber; Development of Trade; Conference of European Statisticians; Senior Advisors on Environmental and Water Problems; Senior Advisors on Science and Technology; Senior Economic Advisors; and a number of subsidiary bodies which deal with special problems included in the committees' programs. Additional subjects of interest to the Commission are dealt with by *ad hoc* groups, notably the Senior Advisors on Energy, the Group of Experts on Standardization Policies, and the Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation. From time to time, and often in conjunction with other mutilateral organizations such as the FAO and ILO, ECE convenes special symposia, seminars and conferences. Study tours to member countries are occasionally arranged in connection with such meetings. A substantial number of U.S. Government departments and agencies, as well as congressional and private sector representatives, actively participate in ECE-sponsored meetings.

The Commission held its 43rd session April 12–21, in Geneva. The meeting was held against a backdrop of the ongoing CSCE review in Vienna and an improved overall East-West relationship. Negotiations on the 18 resolutions adopted by the Commission took place in an atmosphere of cooperation and collaboration. In resolutions of key importance to the United States, language reflecting Western views predominated and Secretariat and Eastern initiatives were modified to fit Western priorities.

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) was established in 1947. The United States was one of the original 10 members. At present, there are 38 members and 10 associate members. Five members (France, Netherlands, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and the United States) are from outside the region, which covers an extensive area from Mongolia south to New Zealand, and from Iran east to the island nations in the Pacific. ESCAP's headquarters are in Bangkok, although some subsidiary bodies and other activities are located in other Asian cities.

ESCAP's primary role is to serve member countries by identifying problems in the area of social and economic development, providing a forum for debate on development issues, providing technical assistance and advisory services, and helping members attract outside assistance. It does not itself provide capital resources, but helps establish institutions to attract funds for regional and subregional projects which, in turn, supply development assistance.

The annual sessions of the Commission provide the main guidance for ESCAP's program and activities, and to the Secretariat which prepares reports and compiles statistics on current economic issues in the region for distribution to member governments. It also prepares and services the meetings of the Commission and the following seven substantive committees: Agricultural Development; Development Planning and Statistics; Industry, Human Settlements and Technology; Natural Resources; Population and Social Development; Trade; and Shipping, Transport and Communications. The present work program and activities are concentrated in six priority areas: food and agriculture; energy; raw materials and commodities; transfer of technology; international trade; and integrated rural development.

ESCAP is primarily funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, ESCAP receives funding from other UN agencies, especially UNDP, to which the United States is a major contributor. Finally, the United States has from time to time participated in individual ESCAP programs of special interest by providing extra-budgetary contributions.

The 44th session was held in Jakarta from April 11–20. At that meeting, the Commission adopted 11 resolutions, including the Jakarta Plan of Action on Human Resources Development. The Jakarta Plan was the culmination of a long process of examination of the issue by the Commission which began at its 42nd session. The issue was further examined at the 43rd session of the Commission and guidelines for the Plan were formulated by an expert group which met in Tokyo in December 1987. The Plan provides broad guidelines for policy formulation and implementation in this area.

During the work of the 44th session, the developing countries frequently raised concerns about national and international economic issues such as protectionism, commodity prices, declining economic assistance and stimulation of industrial growth. The U.S. Delegation continued to stress the need for an open trading system, market-oriented development strategies, a greater role for the private sector and better use of UN system resources. For the most part, the session was marked by an absence of political rhetoric, although the Iranian delegation attempted unsuccessfully to introduce language about chemical warfare.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) was established in 1948 as a regional organization to promote the economic development of Latin America and to strengthen economic ties among Latin American countries and between them and the rest of the world. To this end, ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the Latin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the region, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and provides training and technical assistance. ECLAC has 35 Western Hemisphere members (including the United States and Canada) 4 nonregional members (France, United Kingdom, The Netherlands and Portugal) and 4 associate members (the British Virgin Islands, U.S. Virgin Islands, the Netherlands Antilles and Montserrat). ECLAC is headquartered in Santiago, Chile, and has branch offices in Washington, D.C., and in six Latin American countries.

ECLAC's primary role is to serve member countries by identifying problems in the region in the area of economic development. ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the Latin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the region, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and provides training and technical assistance. The biennial Commission sessions provide guidance for ECLAC's programs and activities.

ECLAC is funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, ECLAC receives funding from other UN agencies, especially UNDP and UNFPA, as well as from bilateral sources.

ECLAC's general sessions or plenaries are held in even years usually in a different Latin American capital each time. The 21st ECLAC plenary, which met in Mexico City, April 17–25, 1986, adopted a resolution to hold an extraordinary session of ECLAC in Mexico City in January 1987, to consider debt and other regional economic issues (the United States alone abstained).

The Special Conference of ECLAC was held in Mexico City, January 19–23, 1987. The Latin American debt crisis dominated the proceedings of the Conference. The ECLAC Latin American and Caribbean Group, CEGAN (ECLAC members excluding the United States and other industrialized countries), circulated an unbalanced declaration advancing the view that external factors were the principal cause of the region's economic difficulties. The United States opposed this document and stressed the need for appropriate structural adjustment policies, including support for the private sector. A compromise was reached whereby the CEGAN declaration, more moderate ECLAC Secretariat documents, and a statement of U.S. views were given equal weight in the final document of the Conference. The Conference did not adopt any resolutions.

The ECLAC Committee of the Whole, which meets in the intervening years between Commission plenary sessions, was held in New York, August 13–14, 1987. The Committee met to review work of the Commission since its last plenary session and to prepare for the 22nd session. The U.S. Delegation was successful in introducing private sector issues into the work program for the following biennium.

The 22nd session of the Commission took place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, April 20–27. The plenary session commemorated ECLAC's 40th anniversary and adopted resolutions on technical and economic cooperation among developing countries and regions; the preparation of the new International Development Strategy for the Fourth UN Development Decade; and the need to take the environment into account in fostering sustainable development. In addition, the plenary session approved ECLAC's work program for 1990–1991.

A majority of delegations which spoke during the plenary debate called for additional measures by the creditor nations and commercial banks to address the debt problems, with a number of developing countries demanding outright debt reduction or relief. The plenary interventions by a number of delegations, however, particularly the Caribbeans, were more positive than in previous sessions. There was greater emphasis by the developing countries themselves on the need for domestic reforms as a basis for making progress on their economic and financial problems.

The statement of the head of the U.S. Delegation, Ambassador Richard Williamson, focused on the direct relationship and interplay between economic and political freedom. Outlining the U.S. position on the external debt problems of the Latin American countries, Ambassador Williamson stated that there was a need for economic reforms as the basis for growth. He emphasized the need to develop the private sector, get governments out of the productive sectors and remove excessive government regulation of economic activity. Ambassador Williamson further stressed the importance of a freer trading system and the critical role of the Uruguay Round in advancing the trade prospects of developing countries as well as those of the industrialized world. Finally, Ambassador Williamson emphasized the willingness of the United States to pursue a cooperative approach to the development of the region and called for ECLAC to help meet the needs of the present and the future—not of times past.

The work of the plenary session was disrupted by one-sided, political attacks on the United States by the Cuban and Mexican delegations. The Cubans attacked the United States at the outset of the plenary debate. Ambassador Williamson replied immediately and forcefully. Later in the session, several Latin American delegations, led by the Mexicans and Brazilians, insisted on annexing to the official report a document prepared by the Latin American Economic System (SELA) condemning the U.S. actions in Panama. After a vote, the document was entered into the official record. For this reason, the United States formally objected to the official report of the session. The U.S. Delegation, however, successfully disputed claims to a Latin and Caribbean consensus on this issue, thereby undermining the statement's credibility and legitimacy.

Economic Commission for Africa

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) was established in 1958 as a regional organization to promote economic development in Africa. Full membership is limited to independent African countries of which 51 are currently members. The United States, while not a member, maintains liaison with ECA headquarters in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and attends some of its meetings as an observer. During 1983-1987, the United States provided financial and technical assistance through the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

The ECA is charged with promoting the economic and social development of Africa, strengthening economic relations among African countries and territories, undertaking studies on economic development, collecting, evaluating and disseminating economic and technical information, and helping to formulate policies to promote economic development. ECA also provides advisory services to its members in various economic and social fields.

The ECA is funded primarily by the UN regular budget. In addition, the ECA receives funding from other UN agencies and bilateral donors. U.S. AID concluded a technical assistance agreement with the ECA in 1983 to provide $710,000 during 1983-1987 for the support of two projects aimed at: (a) strengthening human resources planning and development management training at the Institute for Economic Development and Planning in Dakar, Senegal, and (b) improving the communications capability of ECA's African Training and Research Center for Women.

The Commission commemorated the 30th anniversary of its founding in Niamey, Niger, April 16-17. The 23rd session of the Commission and 14th meeting of the Conference of Ministers met in Niamey, April 14-18. The Conference adopted 10 resolutions relating to, *inter alia*, the following topics: implementation of the recommendations of the Khartoum Declaration relating to concern that the human dimension be adequately taken into account in assistance provided to African countries; the integration of African women in the development process and in trade and commerce; and the UN Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.

Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia

The Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) was established in 1974. Currently, there are 14 members including the PLO.

Although a UN member of the region involved, Israel was effectively excluded from membership because of the original wording of the 1973 ECOSOC resolution establishing the Commission. The United States objected at the time, considering that the language was contrary to the terms of the UN Charter. The Commission's headquarters was moved from Beirut to Baghdad in 1981 because of war damage in Beirut. The name of the Commission was changed in 1986 from the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) to its current name to reflect the Commission's greater emphasis on social issues. ESCWA is funded by the UN regular budget.

The 14th session of ESCWA was held March 31–April 5, 1987, in Baghdad. In addition to ESCWA members, several countries attended the meeting as observers, including the United States.

Discussions in the 14th session were characterized by concern over falling oil prices and revenues and their impact on development and the conditions of migrant labor. The commission approved a work program for 1988–1989 which includes, *inter alia,* the following program areas: food and agriculture; development issues and policies; human settlements; international trade and development finance; natural resources; industrial development; population; social development; transport and communications; transnational corporations; and management of technical cooperation activities.

There were no meetings of the Commission in 1988.

UN Development Program

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) is a voluntary fund which finances the world's largest multilateral program of grant technical cooperation. UNDP was established in 1966 through the merger of two earlier UN programs, the Special Fund and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. The General Assembly established UNDP to be the principal UN mechanism for financing technical cooperation activities. UNDP provides grant technical assistance to developing countries and territories at their request, with increasing emphasis on assistance to the poorest countries. In 1988 UNDP projects were underway in some 150 countries and territories.

UNDP's programs consist of projects lasting from a few months to several years in agriculture (land and water utilization, food processing), industry (product development, pilot plants), education (teacher training, literacy programs), health (maternal and child health care services, medical training), economic policy and planning (institutes for economic planning, national statistical services), transportation (water and air transportation, rural transportation) and natural resource exploration (mining techniques, mineral exploration techniques). UNDP also undertakes smaller projects such as fellowships for the training of nationals of developing countries and provides such countries with needed skills through the use of expert advisers.

In addition, UNDP undertakes preinvestment and feasibility studies to promote developing country and external investor interest in capital projects aimed at expanding production and employment. Projects are normally executed for UNDP by one of the 29 participating agencies of the UN system, such as FAO, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (DTCD), UNIDO, ILO, UNESCO, World Bank or ICAO. UNDP also directly undertakes a small number of projects through its own Office for Projects Services.

UNDP is headquartered in New York. Its Administrator, William H. Draper III, of the United States, assumed office in May 1986. His term expires December 31, 1989. He is eligible for reappointment.

GOVERNING AND ADVISORY BODIES

UNDP is a subsidiary organ of the UN General Assembly, which sets overall UNDP policy. UNDP's operating policies are established and its programs and budgets approved by a Governing Council composed of representatives of 48 states—21 developed and 27 developing.* The Governing Council reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC, which elects states to the Council for 3-year terms. In view of the leading role which the United States plays in UNDP affairs, the United States has been a member of the Governing Council since its establishment. The Council holds regular sessions once a year in June. There is also a brief organizational meeting in February as well as a shorter special session to deal with special items which come up between sessions of the regular Governing Council.

The UNDP Governing Council provided oversight for the following bodies in 1988: UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, UN Sudano-Sahelian Office, UN Fund for Science and Technology for Development, UN Trust Fund for Colonial Countries and Peoples, Energy Account, UN Special Fund for Landlocked Developing Countries, UN Development Fund for Women, Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries and the Inter-Agency Procurement Services Unit. The Council also provides policy guidance for the small program of technical assistance financed from the regular UN budget, and is the governing body for the UN Population Fund (UNFPA).

---

* The following states were members of the UNDP Governing Council in 1988:
Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, China, People's Rep. of, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, German Dem. Rep., Germany, Fed. Rep. of, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Korea, Rep. of, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Spain, Sudan, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.

SECRETARIAT AND FIELD ORGANIZATION

UNDP's administrative apparatus consists of a secretariat in New York and 112 offices in developing countries and territories where programs are being carried out. Assisted by their staffs, UNDP Resident Representatives advise recipient governments on development planning and UN assistance. Within their countries of assignment, they coordinate UNDP programs and, where appropriate, those of the UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, the UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration and UNFPA. Resident Representatives also act for and support the work of the World Food Program, the UN Environment Program, the Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

In most countries, the UN Secretary General has designated the UNDP Resident Representative as Resident Coordinator of the UN Operational Activities for Development. As such, he or she is responsible for overseeing all UN agency development activities in the country to which he/she is accredited. A review is ongoing of the UN's operational activities and the future role of the UNDP, including the functions of the field office.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Patterns of Development Assistance

UNDP development assistance is allocated to countries and inter-country activities based on anticipated development assistance allocations called Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs), which cover 5-year planning cycles. The First Planning Cycle extended from 1972 through 1976, the Second Cycle was from 1977 through 1981, the Third Cycle was from 1982 through 1986, and the Fourth Cycle began in 1987 and will run through 1991. IPFs in the First Cycle were set largely on the basis of the aid that UNDP supplied from 1967 through 1971. That is, countries had a claim upon UNDP resources during that cycle equal to the percentage of UNDP assistance they actually received in the earlier 5-year period. IPF figures for the Second Planning Cycle were primarily based on country populations and per capita GNPs. In allocating the IPFs for the Third Cycle, the Governing Council gave highest priority to countries with the lowest per capita GNPs or which were otherwise disadvantaged. (Decision 80/30, adopted by consensus June 26, 1980.) For the Fourth Cycle, about 64 percent of country program resources will be allocated to countries with a per capita GNP of $375 or less, and the concept of graduation requires that recipient countries with per capita income of $3,000 or more attain net contributor status.

Activities and Analysis

The organizational meeting and special session of the 35th session met in February 1988 in New York. Debate in the organizational meeting centered on preparations for the 35th regular session of the Governing Council, including the issue of the need to rationalize UNDP's budget (both the administrative and program budgets), to consolidate them and to identify key core program costs and make systematic provisions for their funding. Also considered was the question of agency support costs which will be examined as a part of the consideration of the future role of UNDP.

The special session meeting immediately following the organizational meeting had a heavy agenda under which it approved several country programs, considered the response of Administrator William H. Draper III (U.S.) to a Nordic study of UNIFEM on the funding of projects to involve women in economic development activities, approved an AIDS-related blood safety project to be implemented by WHO with UNDP's field network, approved an additional $4 million for projects benefiting Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, and received a report of the Administrator which outlined several improvements in UNDP's management procedures to ensure project quality. A major issue for the session was UNDP's response to emergency situations in Africa and ways to relate longer term developmental assistance to the short-term responses to emergencies.

The Governing Council held its 35th session in June in Geneva. A major decision resolved in the Council concerned the allocation of $600 million of additional resources previously unanticipated which have devolved upon UNDP from increased contributions and the change in the dollar exchange rate. Most of these resources were allocated to individual country programs.

The United States and other major donors were successful in having a substantial portion of the resources ($110 million) retained for centrally funded programs, thus providing for a greater degree of influence on their expenditure by the governing body; the goal being to ensure the effectiveness of expenditures.

The Council approved $60 million of these funds to establish a Management Development Program aimed at supporting long-term management improvements in developing countries.

Another $20 million was allocated to the Central American Special Plan, whose purpose, as approved by the UN General Assembly, is to strengthen existing regional and subregional institutions in their developmental activities.

A further $30 million was earmarked to enhance UNDP activities of program development, project design, disaster relief and technical assistance coordination.

The Council approved 13 country programs as well as the Arab states regional program. The majority of Fourth Cycle country programs were approved at the previous Council session.

Other decisions of the Council were:

— To begin a process of review of the arrangements under which UNDP reimburses implementing agencies for project execution. The practice of support costs is key to the evolving relationships of UNDP with the UN specialized agencies and will be looked at in this broad context.

— Agreement on process for the mid-term review of the 1987–1991 country programs. This was in response to a U.S. initiative.

— To restructure the budget of the UN Volunteers Program to make it more transparent and to provide the Council with greater control while maintaining a necessary degree of flexibility.

Two sessions of the Working Group of the Committee of the Whole were held in New York in 1988. Discussions in the Working Group are informal, with no agreed upon conclusions or records of meetings. They are meant to provide an open and less formal exchange among donors and recipients, and to provide for review of UNDP programming and policies.

Items dealt with in 1988 were an examination of what the UNDP was doing in the implementation of the UN Program of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development (UNPAAERD).

Several aspects of UNDP's technical assistance programs were considered, including project identification and design, appraisal, monitoring, and evaluation; and the use of National Technical Cooperation Assessment Programs (NATCAPS).

The United States presented its thoughts on how UNDP's mid-term reviews of country programs could best be conducted to meet their objectives, stressing the need for in-depth reviews of changes in the country program brought about in response to changes in a country's political or economic environment, for example, the realignment of the country program with World Bank-sponsored structural adjustment programs.

The United States made a voluntary contribution of $110 million to UNDP in 1988, up from $107.5 million in 1987. Our contribution represented 11.3 percent of resources pledged to UNDP for 1988.

UN VOLUNTEERS

The UN Volunteers (UNV) program, established by the General Assembly at its 25th session, began operation in January 1971. The program provides educated and skilled volunteers to developing countries to assist them in development activities. Volunteers are recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible, including, in particular, the developing countries. The volunteers are specialists at the level (middle-level and operational) for which they volunteer and are assigned.

The General Assembly designated the Administrator of the UN Development Program (UNDP) as the Administrator of the UNV. A Coordinator based in Geneva promotes and coordinates the recruitment, selection and administrative management of the activities of the volunteers within the UN system. This arrangement permits dovetailing of UNDP's technical assistance activities with the expertise available through the volunteer program. Many volunteers are assigned to UNDP field offices, to the projects funded by UNDP or the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

UNDP resources, as well as financing from the Special Voluntary Fund and other resources, support the activities of the volunteers. Expenditures for 1988 amounted to $20.6 million. This consisted of: $11.0 million allocated to the projects directly executed by UNV and the external costs of all volunteers from developing countries; and $9.6 million for financing UNVs assigned to projects executed by other UN agencies.

The U.S. Peace Corps works closely with UNV to recruit and sponsor American volunteers. The Peace Corps also provides their external expenses. In 1988 the United States, through the Peace Corps budget, pledged $100,000 to the Special Voluntary Fund. This sum represents 7.34 percent of total pledges amounting to $1,363,237. Leading contributors to the Fund in 1987 were Italy ($343,511), Belgium ($214,477), Switzerland ($201,352), the Federal Republic of Germany ($170,753), Norway ($157,480) and Denmark ($102,639).

The United States, with 31 Volunteers, has more of its nationals assigned to UNV than any other country.

The number of Volunteers in service reached 1,534 in 1988, of which 1,359 (88 percent) are from developing countries. They are currently serving in 102 countries on every continent. Volunteers are assigned to many sectors of development, primarily agriculture, health and education.

The UNDP Governing Council consideration of the UNV Program at the 35th session revolved around three related items: (1) recommendations of the external assessment of the Program conducted at the request of the 34th Governing Council; (2) UNDP's response to these recommendations; and (3) corresponding reforms in UNV's budget and financing arrangements.

UNDP Secretariat and member states joined in praising the performance of UNV Executive Coordinator Hikmat Nabulsi, who retired from his post October 21, and welcomed Brenda McSweeney (U.S.) as the new Coordinator.

The Evaluation Team's assessment came in for criticism from the developing countries. UNDP's response to the Team's findings was that the assessment did not come up with any startling conclusions and, therefore, UNV should for the most part continue to do what it was already doing. In considering the recommendations, UNDP found some unrealistic, in that to implement them would require a significant increase in resources, e.g., pre-assignment orientation for volunteers.

While developing countries uniformly praised the Program, those from donor countries were less fulsome in their praise and raised numerous concerns about the Program's effectiveness. Developing countries were almost unanimous in their opposition to UNDP's proposal to change the external cost of volunteers from developing countries to a charge on the recipient country's IPF. This position was at odds with the Team's findings in discussion with officials in recipient countries. Developing countries were also almost uniformly in favor of retaining the Special Voluntary Fund for this purpose. Donor countries' concerns on the small number of volunteers from industrialized countries were dismissed by the developing countries as attempts to impose quotas on the Program. Discussion of these issues lead to an active 2-week debate.

In the U.S. statement, the United States commended the Evaluation Team's report. The United States noted that the UNV Program is at the crossroads and that to meet the challenge of the 1990's it would need to evolve in ways to ensure the welfare of the individual volunteer as well as improve the cost effectiveness of the Program. The United States noted that a goal for the Program should be much greater transparency as to sources and uses of resources. The United States suggested an interim bridging arrangement to cover UNV budget requirements for the near term, with a permanent arrangement planned after a review of the budget process, and agreement on detailed improvements.

The Council, in its decisions: requested the Administrator to inform the Council on the results of consultation meetings held with other volunteer sending organizations; recognized the need to streamline recruitment procedures and improve cooperation with volunteer sending societies so that the universal character of the Program can be reflected in the diversity of the volunteers' countries of origin; requested the Administrator to report on the steps taken and results obtained in these areas at the 37th session; stressed the need for adequate and improved pre-assignment preparation, cross-cultural orientation and language training for all volunteers; supported increased collaboration in this area with the sending societies; and stressed the need for precise job descriptions for UNVs', including the framework within which the volunteers' position has been established, and for increased attention to the adequate matching of volunteers' skills with the assignments.

UN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

The UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) is a trust fund administered by the UN Development Program (UNDP). UNCDF provides modest grants to small-scale endeavors that use small-scale, low-cost/low-maintenance technology to create or upgrade agricultural and industrial infrastructure and facilities. The General Assembly, in 1966, established UNCDF which in the years since has directed 90 percent of its assistance to 41 least developed countries.

UNCDF seeks to improve local production and expand indigenous employment skills, and productive capacity. This, in turn, reduces reliance on outside assistance and promotes private initiative. Since the projects are relatively small and apply small-scale technology, they provide the participants with a sense of identification, motivation and early results. In addition, UNCDF seeks the widest participation by the beneficiary group and the maximum use of local resources. Fund projects have included irrigation and food storage facilities, rural school health centers, cottage industries, cooperative credit unions and vocational training facilities.

The UNDP Administrator is the Fund's Managing Director and the UNDP Governing Council provides policy guidance to UNCDF. UNCDF has a small administrative staff in New York headed by an Executive Secretary; it relies on UNDP for proposing and monitoring field projects. However, in countries where CDF has a large program, it assigns a Junior Professional Officer (JPO) seconded from various donor countries to monitor CDF projects at the field level.

At the 35th Governing Council in June 1988, the Administrator reported that during 1987 UNCDF approved $59.1 million in commitments in field activity. Projects in transport and communications accounted for more than one-third of total cumulative commitments. Other important sectors receiving significant UNCDF allocations were: agriculture and agricultural water resources, drinking water, industry, housing, education and training, and health.

The United States first contributed to UNCDF in 1978. The $980,000 U.S. contribution in 1988 was an increase of $19,000 over 1987 and represented 2.5 percent of total UNCDF contributions. Sweden offered the largest contribution ($7.7 million), followed by the Netherlands ($6.9 million) and Norway ($4.6 million). The trend in contributions to UNCDF has continued to rise in 1988 due to real increases in contributions by donors and to the U.S. dollar exchange rate. Contributions in 1988 reached $38.7 million, compared to $32.1 million in 1987.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is not part of the UN system, although it was created at a UN-sponsored conference and GATT cooperates with UN organizations, where appropriate. For example, the GATT Contracting Parties and UNCTAD jointly operate an International Trade Center to assist developing countries in promoting their exports.

The General Agreement is an international agreement which entered into force in January 1948. The United States has been a party to GATT since its inception. In June 1988, membership was at 96 countries, accounting for more than four-fifths of world trade. An additional 28 countries maintain a *de facto* "application" of the GATT and one country, Tunisia, has acceded provisionally.

GATT is the principal multilateral instrument through which the United States seeks to improve the world trading system. It is both a code of rules and a forum in which negotiations and other trade discussions take place. GATT is intended to play a major role in the settlement of trade disagreements between member countries.

The most recent of the eight multilateral rounds of trade negotiations under GATT auspices was launched in September 1986 at Punta del Este, Uruguay. The new round, known as the Uruguay Round, is the most comprehensive of multilateral trade negotiations ever attempted. The Uruguay Round is a key element in the U.S. effort to open markets and fight protectionism.

The previous round of trade negotiations, known as the Tokyo Round, was completed in 1979. In addition to tariff reduction, the Tokyo Round produced, for the first time, an agreement on rules of conduct in nontariff areas; codes on subsidies and countervailing duties; on technical barriers to trade (standards); on import licensing procedures; on antidumping; and on trade in bovine meat, dairy products, and civil aircraft. All went into effect in January 1980. The codes covering government procurement and customs valuation went into effect at the beginning of 1981. The work program adopted in November 1979 gave first priority to implementing the Tokyo Round results, and committees have been established to administer each of the code agreements.

Although the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations contributed significantly to trade liberalization, it soon became evident that another round of trade negotiations was needed to come to grips with remaining impediments to trade, especially to trade in new, nontraditional areas, e.g., services, trade related to intellectual property and investment measures. The depressed worldwide trade and economic situation created a climate in which the United States felt it was particularly important to address the emerging issues of the 1980's as well as to advance unfinished programs.

In November 1982 the Contracting Parties met at the Ministerial level for the first time in 10 years. Work began in 1983 and continued through 1986, culminating in the ministerial agreement initiating the Uruguay Round (GATT document NIN/DEC 20 September 1986). The Round has launched the first multilateral negotiations on services and has incorporated them with negotiations on goods as a part of a single trade negotiation. Ministers agreed to establish a Trade Negotiations Committee to manage the overall negotiations and two negotiating groups to carry out the actual negotiations: a Group on Negotiations on Goods to negotiate traditional GATT issues, including trade related to investment and intellectual property, and a Group on Negotiations on Services to deal with services matters.

After the Punta del Este Ministerial, the focus of the Uruguay Round negotiations shifted to the GATT seat in Geneva. The United States has played a prominent role in the negotiations, by participating fully in the activities of the 15 negotiating groups dealing with various issues. Progress has been made in many important areas, but, much remains to be done before the scheduled conclusion of the round in 1990. For example, at the mid-term review held in Montreal, December 5-8, 1988, Trade Ministers from the contracting parties participating in the round reached agreement on the negotiating frameworks for 11 of 15 negotiating groups. However, agreement could not be reached on how to proceed on agriculture, trade related to intellectual property rights protection, safeguards and textiles. The ministers will meet again in Geneva in April 1989 and attempt to close the gaps in these areas.

The U.S. Government believes that open markets are essential to long term, sustainable growth in the world economy. Therefore, the U.S. Government will continue to promote and support measures to encourage a more open trading system, including the revitalization of GATT. In recent years, GATT's ability to police world trade has diminished due to the inadequacy of current provisions in certain areas (e.g., agriculture), disregard for its provisions by many countries, weaknesses in the GATT dispute settlement system, and the growing volume of trade. The current round of multilateral trade negotiations is reviewing the overall functioning of the GATT system and all the GATT articles, including dispute-settlement mechanisms, in this unprecedented effort to strengthen the international trading system.

The U.S. Government is seeking the successful conclusion of the round as scheduled, including the increased participation in GATT and adherence to GATT disciplines by developing countries, particularly newly industrialized economies.

The U.S. Government gives high priority to: liberalizing trade in agricultural products by improved market access and by eliminating tariffs, quotas and trade distorting subsidies; extending GATT discipline to services as well as trade related to intellectual property and investment measures; and, revitalizing the functioning of the GATT system. At the same time, the U.S. Government will seek improvements in existing GATT subsidy rules; will focus on several practices which impede the free flow of trade in natural resource based products; and will negotiate reductions of tariffs and nontariff measures.

UN Conference on Trade and Development

The UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) is a major organ of the United Nations concerned with economic issues including trade, commodities, debt and development. UNCTAD provides a forum for these issues; makes recommendations to the UN General Assembly on economic issues; produces statistical reports on the economic relationship between developed and developing countries; and provides technical assistance to developing countries in the trade and development area.

Plenary sessions of the Conference meet at intervals of about 4 years to set policy and to outline the direction to be taken in the work program. Between Conference sessions, the Trade and Development Board meets semiannually to carry out the function of the Conference when it is not in session. The Trade and Development Board reports to the Conference and to the UN General Assembly through ECOSOC. The last session of the Conference, UNCTAD VII, met in Geneva, Switzerland, July 9–31, 1987.

UNCTAD has long been associated with the New International Economic Order (NIEO), an ambitious proposal by developing countries to correct the economic gap between developing and developed countries by determining rules governing the movement of goods, services, technology and capital across international boundaries. Under UNCTAD's aegis various agreements have been concluded or are under negotiation in the areas of maritime shipping, transfer of technology, transnational corporations and commodities. Much of the bias towards the New International Economic Order has dissipated over the years because UNCTAD members increasingly rely on market-oriented reforms to stimulate economic growth; because commodity agreements have failed to live up to expectations; and because negotiations of general guidelines for regulating economic relationships between nations have proven difficult.

At UNCTAD VII, a Final Act was adopted which consisted of an assessment of global economic trends and recommendations for policy approaches and specific measures aimed at revitalizing development, growth and international trade. The United States joined in consensus on the Final Act, in part, because it includes unprecedented emphasis on the role of the private sector in developing countries and because it stresses the responsibility of developing countries to undertake domestic market-oriented reforms for economic development.

The 1988 meetings of the Trade and Development Board were less controversial than meetings in the past. At the spring meeting, the Board decided to recommend a UN resolution on the reverse transfer of technology; to update the UNCTAD data base; to provide UNCTAD assistance to developing countries in connection with the Uruguay Round; and to consider establishment of an intergovernmental group of experts on East-South trade. The fall session of the Trade and Development Board focused on debt issues including an UNCTAD Secretariat proposal for banks to forgive 30 percent of the commercial debt of developing countries. While there was no agreement on this proposal, there was consensus on a resolution urging the rescheduling of developing countries' official debt on a multiyear basis and increasing the array of options for reducing official debt as called for in the Toronto Summit Communique.

In 1988 the Trade and Development Board implemented major reforms of UNCTAD administrative procedures and practices including reviewing work programs on a biennial basis; limiting the duration of work programs; reducing the frequency and length of meetings; reducing translation costs; and improving the preparation of documentation. UNCTAD also engaged in a major administrative overhaul seeking to reduce personnel costs and improve the quality of work.

Substantial New Program of Action for the Least Developed Countries

The Substantial New Program of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries (SNPA) was adopted by the General Assembly at its 36th session in 1981. The Program called on both the developed and developing countries to mobilize financial resources, expand trade and investment, develop and implement sound economic structural adjustment policies and improve coordination of aid efforts throughout the remainder of the 1980s. The United States joined consensus in adopting the program but made a statement detailing the numerous reservations the United States had about the program.

In October 1985 the United States participated in UNCTAD's mid-term review of the SNPA. The mid-term review found little improvement and in some cases significant deterioration in the conditions faced by the LDCs. The United States joined other participants in reaffirming the SNPA's original objectives and balanced approach and supported the decision to have a retrospective review of the SNPA in 1990. However, the United States disassociated itself from a call for aid target levels tied to donor countries' GNP and direct intervention in the world commodity markets through an UNCTAD-sponsored Common Fund. The 40th UN General Assembly also called for the Secretary General to report to the 42nd General Assembly on the implementation of the program to that point.

The 42nd General Assembly noted the report of the Secretary General and adopted resolution 42/117 calling for a Second Conference on the Least Developed Countries, bearing in mind the SNPA, to be hosted by France in 1990. Since France will bear the expense of the Conference, the United States joined consensus in adopting the resolution while reiterating its reservations expressed at the time the SNPA was originally adopted.

On December 20 the United States joined the consensus adopting resolution 43/186 which takes note of steps being taken by the UN system in preparing for the Conference and expresses appreciation of UNDP Governing

Council decision 88/30 to use its Special Measures Fund to facilitate the participation of representatives of the least developed countries in the preparatory meetings and Conference itself.

Commission on Transnational Corporations

The Commission on Transnational Corporations (TNCs) was established in 1975 by ECOSOC resolution 19 B (LVII) to assist the Council "in fulfilling its responsibilities in the field of transnational corporations." Its mandate includes: (1) Acting as the forum within the UN system for consideration of issues relating to transnational corporations; (2) promoting the exchange of views between and among governments and nongovernmental groups; (3) providing guidance to the Center on Transnational Corporations, and; (4) developing a code of conduct relating to TNCs.

In January 1986 the U.S. Government decided to limit its participation in the activities of the Commission's Secretariat, the UN Center on Transnational Corporations, because the Commission had never given the Center a clear mandate to include in its work the activities of state-owned enterprises from communist countries and TNCs from developing countries. The United States believes that this is a serious violation of the principle of universality.

The 14th session of the UN Commission on TNCs was held April 6-15. While there were some contentious issues, the general atmosphere was somewhat more subdued than in previous years. The Commission adopted several resolutions including a resolution on Transnational Corporations in South Africa and Namibia which was more strident than previous resolutions on this subject. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 33 to 3 (U.S.) with 5 abstentions. Another resolution introduced by the G-77 on the final day of the session on the role of the Commission contained references to debt and environment which were unacceptable to Group B members. Despite protests from both Group B and Socialist countries over the lateness of its introduction and the refusal of the G-77 to consider changes to the text, it was adopted by a vote of 30 to 6 (U.S.) with 5 abstentions.

CODE OF CONDUCT

In 1977 the Commission established the Intergovernmental Working Group (IGWG) to draft language for an international code of conduct for transnational corporations. The IGWG met 17 times through 1982 but was unable to find language acceptable to all the parties involved. At its 8th session in 1982, the Commission adopted a resolution calling for a special session of the Commission to be convened in 1983 to complete the work on the code. From 1983 to 1987, the special session was reconvened each year to consider further steps to be taken in regard to the code of conduct for TNCs. During the 14th session of the Commission the Expanded Bureau confirmed an ECOSOC decision to continue to consult on the draft code of conduct but further negotiation on the code has been deferred indefinitely.

UN Children's Fund

The UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) was founded in 1946 to help meet the emergency needs of children in the aftermath of World War II. It now provides long-term humanitarian assistance to needy children and mothers in developing countries throughout the world, and promotes and supports health and development activities directed toward child survival and other needs of children. Because of its apolitical character, UNICEF has been able to operate all over the world, including areas in political turmoil such as El Salvador, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola and Uganda. Milestones in UNICEF's history include the Nobel Prize in 1965 and the celebration of its 40th anniversary in 1986.

The Executive Director receives policy guidance and direction from the UNICEF Executive Board composed of 41 member states elected for 3-year terms. The United States has always been a member of this Board, which meets annually at a 2-week session. Special sessions or mail polls may be used to decide issues which cannot wait until the next regular session of the Board.

PROGRAMS

UNICEF allocates resources among countries on the basis of need, using criteria that include: infant mortality rates (IMR), infant morbidity, infant population and per capita GNP. In 1983 the UNICEF Executive Board decided that the IMR should be the most important criterion that would "guide both the level and the content of UNICEF program cooperation." UNICEF's programs are carefully developed and tailored to the recipient country's specific needs and priorities on the basis of a child needs assessment. Rarely are UNICEF's funds the sole source of support for a program; they serve in most instances as a catalyst or critical ingredient to ensure the program's success.

UNICEF programs emphasize developing community-level services to promote the health and well-being of children, including water supply, primary health care, nutrition, education and improving the situation of mothers. They also assist governments in recipient countries through advisory services, inter-country exchanges and other local training exercises. In addition, UNICEF helps procure, package, and deliver medical and other health or education supplies through its centralized supply procurement, packaging and warehousing system which is known as UNIPAC (i.e, UN Procurement and Assembly Center) located in Copenhagen, Denmark. UNICEF is the largest supplier of vaccines to countries for the WHO Expanded Program of Immunization, which has as its goal the immunization of all the world's children against the six major childhood immunizable diseases by 1990.

In 1988 UNICEF spent $400 million on projects in 121 countries. This amount included: $158 million (40 percent) for child health activities, $23 million (6 percent) for child nutrition, $69 million (17 percent) on water supply and sanitation, $29 million (7 percent) on community and family-based services for children, $37 million (10 percent) on formal and non-formal education, $29 million (7 percent) for emergency relief and $52 million (13 percent) for general activities—mainly planning and program preparation, program communications and other program support.

In addition to implementing projects from general resources, UNICEF also identifies many worthwhile projects each year for which it does not have funds in its general resources. These noted projects are listed in an annual catalog approved by the Executive Board and are only implemented if donors contribute additional funds for a specific project. In addition, UNICEF sometimes appeals for emergency funds to assist children and mothers affected by natural or man-made disasters. In 1988 governments and intergovernmental agencies such as the Arab Gulf Fund and the European Common Market also made contributions to UNICEF in the form of supplementary funds for noted projects and emergencies. The United States donated over $28 million in supplementary funds in 1988, with about $2.98 million going to emergency assistance and child survival programs in Africa (Ethiopia, Sudan, Uganda, Madagascar, Burundi and Mali), and over 20 million to India for child survival. The U.S. Agency for International Development also contributed food aid to support UNICEF emergency food assistance programs in Angola (12,1000 metric tons), Ethiopia (1,125 metric tons) and Mali (40 metric tons)—contributions not reflected in the supplementary funds.

THE CHILD SURVIVAL AND DEVELOPMENT REVOLUTION

In the early 1980s, the world health community recognized that several curative and preventative health techniques had become relatively cheap, widely available—even in remote areas—and widely accepted. If these techniques were properly promoted and utilized, UNICEF reasoned, it would be possible by the year 2000 to reduce by half the number of childhood deaths (estimated at 40,000 per day) resulting from childhood immunizable diseases and dehydration from diarrheal diseases. UNICEF's so-called "Child Survival and Development Revolution" (CSDR) was launched in 1983, and includes the use of the four principal tools:

— Growth Charts to detect malnutrition. These are available in 200 languages and dialects for use in some 80 countries.

— Oral Rehydration Therapy (ORT). Diarrhea-caused dehydration is a major killer of children. A combination of sugar and salts mixed with water not only prevents dehydration, but also allows the baby to rehydrate. This part of the Child Survival strategy dovetails very well with UNICEF's traditional water supply and sanitation programs.

— Breast-feeding. UNICEF promotes breast-feeding and proper weaning techniques as a way to prevent infant malnutrition and disease and as a natural birth-spacing technique.

— Immunization against the six major childhood immunizable diseases—measles, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, polio and tuberculosis. Better and cheaper refrigeration networks, as well as vaccines that are less susceptible to heat and damage, make this program possible.

Family spacing, food production and female literacy are also included in the Child Survival strategy.

UNICEF's approach has attracted unprecedented media attention and support from the international community, including endorsements from many world leaders. In 1985 the UN Secretary General wrote to the Chief of State of every UN member country to call attention to the World Health Organization goal of achieving Universal Childhood Immunization (UCI) by 1990 and a 50 percent use of ORT by parents by 1989. Since this appeal was launched, 77 countries—with over 90 percent of the developing world's children—have informed the Secretary General of their intention to strive to achieve UCI by 1990. President Reagan publicly endorsed child survival activities on three occasions, in 1983, 1985 and in a 1988 joint statement with General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union that was issued at the conclusion of their June talks.

In its annual *State of the World's Children* report for 1989 (released on December 20, 1988), UNICEF stated that after almost 4 decades of progress in the developing world, there is a danger of retrogression with the heaviest consequences of the burden of debt and recession being borne by the most vulnerable—the children and the poor.

The report cites important achievements in the decade of the 1980s, particularly in the area of health: the proportion of developing world children immunized has increased from 5 to over 50 percent with some 1.5 million lives saved and 200,000 cases of polio prevented each year. Additionally, use of the low cost oral rehydration therapy, virtually unknown in the developing world at the beginning of the decade, is now used by almost a quarter of the developing world families and saves almost a million lives each year. As a consequence, deaths due to diarrheal disease—the major cause of death among children—are declining.

UNICEF maintains that these advances are being threatened by the continuing economic crisis. It argues the need for action to reduce developing countries' debt burdens. It also urges "real aid for real development" that meets essential needs and is coupled with a political commitment and new financial resources of approximately $30–50 billion more per year in the decade of the 1990s.

In UNICEF's view, now might be the time to convene a "summit for children" to mobilize the political will that could lead to historic breakthroughs for children and protect the physical and mental development of the majority of children under 5. The report maintains that a renewed international commitment to "real development" would benefit the entire international community. It adds that international cooperation to meet the essential needs of all children—and their families "is the greatest investment which it is possible for the human race to make in its future economic prosperity, political stability and environmental integrity."

FUNDING

Contributions to UNICEF are voluntary. In 1988 UNICEF received $296.3 million in voluntary contributions to its general resources from over 110 governments. The U.S. Government contributed $54.40 million, placing it first among the contributors to the general resources budget and accounting for about 18.36 per cent of the total contributions. Other major donors, in descending order, included the Governments of Sweden ($40.95 million, 13.8 percent), Italy ($35.55 million, 11.70 percent), Norway ($29.40 million, 9.86 percent), Finland ($23.21 million, 7.83 percent), Japan ($19.43 million, 6.56 percent), the Netherlands ($13.76 million, 4.64 percent), Canada ($13.69 million, 4.62 percent), the United Kingdom ($13.16 million, 4.41 percent) and Denmark ($11.05 million, 3.71 percent).

In addition to contributions from governments, UNICEF also receives substantial income from private and other nongovernmental donors each year. In addition to net profits from the sale of greeting cards throughout the world, preliminary figures indicate receipt of at least $100 million in 1988 from nongovernmental sources and the United Nations. This amount represents approximately 14.06 percent of UNICEF's total net income (i.e., general resources, supplementary funds and income from contributions to emergencies).

UNICEF's success in raising funds from these sources is unique in the UN system and is largely due to the fundraising activities of 34 national committees and UNICEF headquarters-related offices abroad. The U.S. Committee for UNICEF, a nonprofit organization which has 3 million volunteers throughout all 50 states, is the largest and among the most active of these national committees.

1988 SESSION OF THE UNICEF EXECUTIVE BOARD

The UNICEF Executive Board held its regular session in New York, April 18–23. Board members again noted UNICEF's lead agency role in child survival activities and the need to ensure sustainable progress in those areas. While expressing full support for UNICEF's "Global Alliance for Children," the United States and others voiced concern about the long-term sustainability of

UNICEF programs and cautioned UNICEF not to embark on ambitious goals and objectives entailing still more demands on its already strained resources. Several expressed concern for program balance within the range of child survival and development activities, urging more emphasis on the original components of the "GOBI-FFF" strategy (i.e., growth promotion, oral rehydration, breast-feeding, female literacy, family spacing and food supplements) in addition to immunization and oral rehydration campaigns. UNICEF was urged to be mindful of the "Bellagio III" Declaration which stressed the importance of strengthening and expanding a country's existing primary health care infrastructure. The Executive Director assured the Board that the "Grand Alliance for Children" would not involve any major financial program or staff outlays, but rather a redirection of UNICEF's existing assets to strengthen and expand its network of allies and partners.

The need for sustainability of UNICEF programs and initiatives, program balance and concern about the impact of structural adjustment policies in light of the global economic situation were recurrent themes of Board members' interventions during the general debate and other discussions.

The Board was generally supportive of programs in Africa, the Middle East and other regions. It expressed appreciation for UNICEF's response to emergency situations in Africa, and approved a framework and initial funding for preparatory work in support of the "Bamako Initiative"—a plan adopted by African health ministers in September 1987 with a goal of revitalizing primary health care in Africa. The plan seeks to encourage decentralized, self-sustaining primary health care by mobilizing communities to share in the financing and management of local primary health care services maintained by the proceeds from the sale of good quality essential drugs at low cost.

As an adjunct to UNICEF's "adjustment with a human face initiative," the Board approved creation of a new funding mechanism to permit greater flexibility in responding to the situation caused by economic adjustment in areas of Latin America. A regional project for children in especially difficult circumstances (i.e., street children) also was approved.

The U.S. and other board members fully endorsed UNICEF's involvement in helping to combat the global AIDS pandemic within the context of the global AIDS program and approved national plans.

UNICEF was commended for its programs integrating women into its program sectors. In suggesting areas for further improvement, Board members expressed the view that there is still a sporadic and country specific approach to UNICEF's directives on women in development and that implementation of the strategy remains too dependent on the commitment of individual country representatives.

The Board also commended UNICEF efforts to link water activities with those of other program sections such as control of diarrheal disease and hygiene education, and it praised UNICEF's program of action for water supply. Some Board members, however, voiced concern that UNICEF is not placing enough emphasis on this sector and relies too heavily on supplemental funds. In response, the Executive Director reaffirmed UNICEF's commitment to strengthen water supply and sanitation programs through the next decade.

The Board also expressed support for completion of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in time for adoption by the General Assembly in 1989.

The major elements of the medium-term plan for 1987–1991 received Board support, but account was also taken of omissions and areas needing greater emphasis. The U.S. and other delegations commended UNICEF for improving its monitoring and evaluation process, for working cooperatively with auditors, and for its efforts to improve UNICEF's financial accountability. Board members agreed that voluntary contributions to general resources must remain the major source of income to UNICEF and noted that UNICEF had not addressed the Board's concern over the gradual increase in the use of supplementary funds to fund UNICEF programs. The Executive Director reiterated UNICEF's preference for general resources. Major donors suggested the need for a comprehensive policy and clear operational guidelines for administering supplemental funding. The United States encouraged UNICEF to strike a careful balance between advocacy and program activities, and to participate in global and special events very selectively.

UNICEF received high marks for its interagency coordination, particularly through the joint consultative group on policy (JCHP) and the WHO/UNICEF JCHP. It was commended for fulfilling many of the recommendations (in the areas of field orientation, flexibility and fundraising) in the "Jansson Report" on the UN's operational activities for development, but disappointment was expressed over the lack of depth and paucity of concrete proposals in UNICEF's review of the report. The Board requested the Executive Director to respond more fully at the 1989 Executive Board meeting.

The Board also provided guidance on the formulation of a global strategy as well as UNICEF's strategy for the 1990s which will be discussed at the 1989 Executive Board meeting.

U.S. PRESENCE IN UNICEF

UNICEF has its headquarters in New York. U.S. citizens have held the executive directorship since UNICEF's inception. The current Executive Director is James Grant, a U.S. citizen, who has held this position since January 1, 1980. In 1984 the Secretary General announced the reappointment of Mr. Grant for a second 5-year term ending on December 31, 1989.

UNICEF employs approximately 645 professionals, of whom about 12 percent are U.S. citizens. Importantly, U.S. citizens occupy key policy positions, including the executive directorship of UNICEF and the directorships of two out of UNICEF's six regional divisions.

EXPENDITURES IN THE UNITED STATES

In 1988 UNICEF spent an estimated $60.2 million in the United States. This includes $12.7 million for procurement and $41.3 million for the New York Headquarters staff, but not expenditures related to the greeting card operation.

Human Settlements Activities

The Commission on Human Settlements was established in 1977 and consists of 58 members elected for 3-year terms. The Commission provides policy guidance to the Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT) located in Nairobi, Kenya. The United States has been a member since 1977; the permanent U.S. Representative to the Center in Nairobi is also accredited to the UN Environment Program.

The Commission and the Center were created following the UN Conference at Vancouver, Canada, in 1976. They were designed to consolidate existing UN bodies and to provide greater emphasis on human settlements activities. The Center's responsibilities include: coordinating and reviewing all human settlements activities within the UN system; executing projects related to human settlements development; and serving as a focal point for the provision and exchange of information in this area. The Center performs research, conducts training and devises training modules, carries out technical assistance projects for developing countries and provides information on human settlements through studies, reports and audio visual presentations.

The 11th session of the Commission was held in New Delhi, India, April 6–13. It was attended by 48 of the 58 members states, 35 other states, 10 UN bodies and specialized agencies, 3 intergovernmental organizations and 37 nongovernmental organizations. In addition, the African National Congress (ANC), the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and the Pan Africanist Congress of Tanzania observed the session. The Director of the Office of Housing and Urban Programs, Agency for International Development, headed a 10-person U.S. Delegation which included three private sector advisers, among them the Executive Vice President of the National Association of Realtors (NAR).

The special session reviewed the accomplishments of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH), which was observed in 1987. The main accomplishment of the session was the debate and adoption of the Global Shelter Strategy for the Year 2000 (GSSS) in response to a directive from the UN General Assembly. The GSSS is of major significance to the United States as it endorses the importance of the private sector in the solution of the world's shelter problem. It calls for governments to provide a facilitating environment and to enable market forces to work.

Major addresses were made at the opening ceremony by Dr. Ramachandran, Executive Director of HABITAT, and Mrs. Mohsina Kidwai, Minister of Urban Development, Government of India. Dr. Ramachandran read a message from the UN Secretary General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, and Mr. S. P. Stainov, President of Settlements and Urban Affairs, Government of Bulgaria, and President of the 10th HABITAT session. The Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, Ramasinghe Premadasa, also addressed the opening plenary session.

Dr. Ramachandran stressed the importance of the international community focusing on shelter and the problems of cities in the face of rapid urban growth, especially in the already large cities of the developing world. In his view the shelter conditions of the poor majority in the developing countries are deteriorating and the international community is at a crucial point in its search for new directives in development policy. He stated that the challenge is to adopt strategies that are supportive of economic growth and that meet the basic quality of life needs of the poor. He noted the economic advantage of shelter investments in terms of the absorption of labor, encouragement of indigenous building materials industries, and meeting the needs of the informal sector. Minister Kidwai emphasized the unprecedented challenges stemming from rapid population growth and urbanization. She noted the paradox of life in the cities and towns being increasingly difficult for the poor, despite the fact that cities held the promise of economic opportunity for those who had flocked to them.

The U.S. Delegation made four major statements during the conference. The Head of the Delegation made an opening statement in which he noted the accomplishments of IYSH, but stressed the need to look ahead to the need for new strategies. He described the basic policies of U.S. AID in the shelter sector, including (a) delineating proper roles for the public, private and non-government sectors; (b) strengthening indigenous institutions; and (c) encouraging individual initiative and private sector involvement.

In the Global Strategy debate, the NAR representative on the U.S. Delegation presented the private sector view of shelter policy, noting the role of public-private partnerships and the need for national shelter coalitions to effectively mobilize all the relevant sectors and sufficient resources. A U.S. AID representative on the delegation discussed the Sector Lending Approach, with its goal of strengthening the fundamental elements of the shelter delivery system.

The Delegation announced the 1988 U.S. voluntary contribution of $400,000 dollars, bringing the 3-year total to nearly 1.2 million, and making the United States a major contributor to HABITAT.

Population Activities

The UN Secretary General established the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) in 1967 as a special trust fund. Renamed the UN Population Fund in 1987, it operates under the guidance of ECOSOC and, since 1972, with the general oversight of the Governing Council of the UN Development Program (UNDP). Dr. Nafis Sadik of Pakistan, long a senior official of the Fund, assumed the duties of Executive Director in 1987. UNFPA is second only to the U.S. Government itself as a source of assistance for population activities in developing countries. It had a budget of $179 million in 1988 and finances projects in 130 countries. The Fund is working to devote an increasing ratio of its resources to family planning activities per se, to confine its commitment levels to reasonable expectations and to retain sufficient flexibility so that the assistance will be geared to the circumstances of the recipient country.

In 1985 U.S. AID withheld $10 million of the $46 million that Congress had earmarked for UNFPA after reports surfaced that women were forced to obtain abortions or submit to sterilization procedures. Congress then passed the Kemp-Inouye amendment which prohibits U.S. AID from providing assistance to an organization which supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

At that time, the Administrator reviewed the UNFPA program in China and made a determination that UNFPA was ineligible for funding under this restriction. This determination was subsequently upheld in the U.S. courts. No U.S. AID funds were provided for UNFPA in 1986, 1987 and 1988. Funds reserved in these years were reprogrammed into other family planning activities.

U.S. AID continues to reserve funds for UNFPA each year in the event that a significant change in UNFPA's assistance to China or in the Chinese population program itself would make it possible to consider a resumption of U.S. AID support. $5 million for FY 1989 and $20 million for FY 1990 are being reserved. UNFPA and China have negotiated a new agreement for the 1990–1994 period which will be presented for approval at the UNDP Governing Council, at which the United States is represented, in June 1989.

The UNFPA and the Government of China have separately disputed the U.S. claims. China denies that it condones, much less encourages, coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization. China emphasizes the long and challenging task it faces of tackling problems of rapid population growth, and stresses that the solution to the problem depends on the voluntary participation of its people. The statement further emphasized the importance China attaches to exchanges with other countries on population issues. UNFPA denies it manages or contributes to such activity in China or elsewhere.

In her review of the financial situation of UNFPA, the Executive Director indicated that pledges totaled $149.3 million in 1987, a 12 percent increase over 1986, with 90 donors contributing to the Fund. There was an increase of over 10 percent in the contributions of all major donors along with favorable exchange rates. In 1988 UNFPA again achieved a record level of contributions of approximately $176 million, with first-time contributions from the U.S.S.R. and Algeria, among other countries. Commenting on the absence of a U.S. contribution, the Executive Director stated,

> The absence of the United States from the group of contributors leaves a gap in the international consensus on population issues. The backing of the United States, one of the Fund's oldest supporters, has been very important to the Fund's financial well-being. But almost equally important has been the moral support which the United States has given to population programs. We continue discussions with the U.S. Government and sincerely hope that it will return among the major donors to the Fund.

Despite the fact that it has made no contribution to UNFPA, the United States remains an active participant in UNFPA's governing body. The 35th session of the Governing Council was marked by overall endorsement of the Fund's leadership and efforts to improve program effectiveness and outreach. The UNFPA expressed satisfaction with the positive and constructive U.S. participation.

The 35th session of the Governing Council reviewed a total of 35 documents, plus 11 information papers submitted by UNFPA. In the plenary session, Council members endorsed documents on the status of financial implementation of Council-approved country programs; the periodic report on evaluation; UNFPA's Workplan for 1989–1992; and the system of priority countries for population assistance. During the day and a half of the Committee of the Whole, four intercountry programs for 1988–1991 for sub-Saharan Africa, Arab States and Europe, Asia and Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean were reviewed and approved by consensus. Also approved were 16 new multiyear country programs.

UNFPA also presented for Council review and approval for the first time the Interregional Program for 1988–1991. Included in this umbrella program was: support for contraceptive research and development; research and training in population and development planning; interregional backstopping of regional and country initiatives; training in new techniques of data analysis to increase the use of census and survey data; designing strategies for incorporating women's concerns into population and development planning; and population awareness and information dissemination to policymakers, program managers and the general public.

As part of UNFPA's effort to strengthen substantive and strategic programming, three major program initiatives were launched in 1987—a wide ranging review and assessment of accumulated program experience over the last 20 years; the strategy on women, population and development; and the strategy for assistance to sub-Saharan Africa. Detailed reports on these efforts are to be submitted to the 1989 Governing Council. Also highlighted was UNFPA's 1988 State of the World Population report entitled "Safeguarding the Future," which described the relationships between population growth, resources, the environment and sustainable development. Council members enthusiastically endorsed the Fund's efforts to promote awareness of these linkages, and to integrate environmental concerns into other activities. There was also widespread support among the delegations for UNFPA's attention to the AIDS pandemic and the Fund's role in the global program on AIDS.

The United States endorsed UNFPA's efforts to improve the overall quality, efficiency and outreach of its programs, noting with satisfaction the strengthening of program monitoring and evaluation, expanded opportunities for staff training and improved donor coordination. We indicated that we will follow with interest implementation of new organizational changes, and joined other delegations in looking forward to a progress report on the impact of those changes on the Fund's overall program.

The United States also cited a number of examples of complementary and well-coordinated efforts between UNFPA and U.S. AID in such areas as contraceptive development, data collection and analysis, population awareness-raising and policy planning and implementation.

The Council approved a revised appropriation of $63,233,400 for the 1988–1989 biennium, an increase of 6.3 percent over the initial amount approved at the 34th Governing Council.

The World Food Council

The UN General Assembly created the World Food Council (WFC) pursuant to resolution 22 of the 1974 World Food Conference. The Council offers advice and recommendations on world food and agricultural problems and policy issues. The WFC performs this function primarily through its annual ministerial session. The Council is composed of 36 member states which are nominated by the ECOSOC and elected by the General Assembly to represent the various regions of the world. The United States and the U.S.S.R. have been members of WFC continuously since its establishment. The Executive Director of the WFC Secretariat is Gerald Trant (Canada). The WFC Secretariat has a staff of 13 professionals, of whom one is an American, and a budget of $2.0 million per year.

The WFC held its 14th ministerial session in Nicosia, Cyprus, May 23–26. The U.S. Delegation to the meeting was headed by Dr. Joan Wallace, Administrator of the USDA Office of International Cooperation and Development. At the session, the WFC President, Eduardo Pesqueira (Mexico), reported on his activities in support of WFC initiatives during the year. He urged member nations to work together to combat hunger and malnutrition. Dr. Mostafa Tolba, Executive Director of the UN Environment

Program, presented an address entitled "Environmental Security Means Food Security."

Regarding a Secretariat paper on global hunger and malnutrition, the U.S. Delegation expressed general support. The U.S. Delegation pointed out, however, that a significant amount of scarce resources unfortunately must be devoted to dealing with man-made disasters, such as refugee problems. The U.S. statement also referred to the devastating locust infestation in Africa, the importance of minimizing civil strife, and the nutritional status of children. Commenting on the report entitled "Food Security and International Agricultural Trade," the U.S. Delegation reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to achieve fundamental reform in agricultural policy by the elimination over a 10-year period of all agricultural subsidies and import restrictions.

The central debate at the session was on the Secretariat's proposal for an international hunger initiative, presented in a paper entitled "Growing Hunger Amidst Food Surpluses: The Potential for Hunger Reduction Through Food Surplus Based on Development Assistance." Virtually all members expressed willingness to participate in a consultative group on the initiative, called the "Cyprus Initiative." The mandate of the Cyprus Initiative is to review policies to combat hunger and malnutrition in developing countries, particularly in low-income food-deficit countries, and identify obstacles to their effectiveness. The study seeks to identify workable new policy initiatives and realistic measures to make existing policies more effective.

The consultative group on the Cyprus Initiative was established on October 19 by an *ad hoc* meeting held at the United Nations in New York. The first meeting of the consultative group was held in Paris, December 19–20.

SOCIAL ISSUES

Crime Prevention and Control

The United States joined consensus on a resolution approved by the UN General Assembly on the subject of crime prevention and criminal justice. The resolution focused on ways and means of implementing the Milan Plan of Action. In particular, resolution 43/99 encouraged the cooperation of member states with the work of the UN regional and interregional institutes for crime prevention and control and endorsed recommendations from ECOSOC related to the preparation for the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, to be held in 1990. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to redeploy staff and funds to the UN program of work in crime prevention and criminal justice.

The first regular session of ECOSOC, adopted without a vote a resolution reviewing the functioning and program of work of the UN in crime prevention and criminal justice. (Resolution 1988/44.)

Committee on Crime Prevention and Control

The Committee on Crime Prevention and Control held its 10th biennial session in Vienna, August 1988. The Committee is composed of 27 members. The United States was represented by its expert member, Mr. Ronald L. Gainer, Associate Deputy Attorney General. The Committee considered a broad range of issues, including UN activities in the field of crime prevention and control, review of the functioning and program of work of the United Nations in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice, preparation for the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in 1990, and crime prevention and criminal justice in the context of development. The Seventh Congress met in Milan in July 1985.

The report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control in its 10th session adopted 14 draft resolutions and 1 draft decision. They will be considered by the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council, May 1989.

The first resolution concerned the UN Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute. An annex to the resolution contained the statute for the Institute. The purpose of the Institute is to contribute to the formulation and implementation of improved policies in the field of crime prevention and control. The second resolution concerned the implementation of the Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power. The resolution calls on member states to pass legislation to simplify access by victims of crime to the criminal justice system. The third resolution was about the UN network of government appointed national correspondents in the field of crime prevention and control. The resolution commended the network on its research and reporting on developments in crime and juvenile delinquency and criminal justice operations. The fourth resolution was on the African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. The headquarters of the Institute is in Kampala, Uganda.

The fifth resolution outlined 15 procedures for the effective implementation of the Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary. The sixth resolution contained guidelines for the effective implementation of the Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials. The seventh resolution was on concerted international action against the forms of crime identified in the Milan Plan of Action. The eighth resolution outlined the implementation of UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice. The resolution called on member states to adopt national legislation to implement the UN standards. The resolution also called on the Secretary General to prepare and publish a compilation of all existing UN standards and norms in crime prevention. The ninth resolution was on the implementation of the safeguards guaranteeing protection of the rights of those facing the death penalty.

The 10th resolution was on the effective prevention and investigation of extra-legal, arbitrary and summary executions. The resolution contains a series of principles on the prevention, investigation and legal proceedings related to extra-legal, arbitrary and summary executions. The 11th resolution discussed the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, also known as the Beijing Rules. The 12th resolution was on domestic violence. The 13th resolution was a review of the functioning and program of work of the United Nations in crime prevention and criminal justice. The resolution called upon the Secretary General to incorporate into his medium term plan a separate program on crime and justice and to include in the budget sufficient resources in support of the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch to enable it to implement fully its activities. The 14th resolution concerned the preparations for the Eighth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders. The Eighth Congress will be held from August 27—September 7, 1990, with the necessary pre-Congress consultations. The theme for the Eighth Congress will be "International cooperation in crime prevention and criminal justice for the twenty-first century."

The draft decision contained the report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control on its 10th Session and the provisional agenda for the 11th session.

Drug Abuse Control

During 1988 the United States continued to utilize the UN system to pursue key international drug control goals. A major multilateral achievement in this area was adoption of the UN Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, on December 19 in Vienna, Austria. This concluded a 4-year effort to complete a treaty that contains strong provisions for law enforcement and diplomatic cooperation. This initiative, along with continued follow-up to the recommendations of the June 1987 International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking (ICDAIT) and the regular drug control efforts of the United Nations, were evidence of the high priority that drug control continued to receive within UN and multilateral activity.

To assure the success of the new convention in particular, and continued progress on other drug control endeavors, the United States provided financial and personnel resources to the UN Division of Narcotic Drugs and the Secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board. In addition, the United States continued to work through the three UN intergovernmental bodies most involved in drug control activities—the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND), the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the UN General Assembly.

The United States also worked closely with the UN Secretariat, particularly during development of the Convention, to ensure its successful conclusion, worked with UN member states from all regions to assure that the convention was adopted and to ensure that UN drug control program activities, at the country level, continued to gain wide support.

During 1988 contributions increased substantially to the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), a voluntary fund established in 1971 largely through U.S. efforts. An American continued to serve as UNFDAC Deputy Director and, as elsewhere in the UN system, efforts continued to ensure the employment of U.S. citizens in suitable positions at appropriate levels.

As agreed at ICDAIT, June 26 was established as the International Day Against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking, and events were held in support of ICDAIT recommendations and conclusions on that date in 1988. On this occasion, President Reagan issued a statement about the need for drug abuse control, and nongovernmental organizations planned a program in New York City to raise public awareness and to stimulate community interest.

UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND ECOSOC

The 43rd UN General Assembly in November added impetus to the growing momentum to finalize a new convention before the year's end. It adopted a resolution on preparation of a draft convention against illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances which called on states to assign highest priority to the upcoming Plenipotentiary Conference.

Other resolutions adopted addressed the international campaign against traffic in drugs, the use of children in the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and the rehabilitation of drug-addicted minors.

On behalf of the United States, Ann Wrobleski, Assistant Secretary for International Narcotic Matters, pointed out that the transnational nature of the drug problem requires an international approach, and that efforts to control the activities of drug traffickers must be supported at the multilateral level. She expressed the U.S. position that the new drug trafficking treaty should be a strong new instrument and complement existing international conventions. In addition, she advocated that the United Nations undertake a study on the use of herbicides in crop reduction.

In October, First Lady Nancy Reagan, accompanied by Secretary of State George Shultz, addressed the Third Committee on the effects of the international drug problem on youth, crime and families. Demonstrating her concern about the drug abuse issue, she cited consumer demand as the instigator of the illicit trade. The U.S. Delegation reported that the speech had a strong, constructive impact on the proceedings of this committee and that Mrs. Reagan's personal credibility lent additional impact to the key issue of enhanced UN involvement in the drug control area.

President Reagan, in his own address to the UN General Assembly a few weeks earlier, had commended the United Nations on its work in the area of drug abuse control. He called for completion of the anti-trafficking convention as a priority activity and, expressing intolerance for drug traffickers, called for a war against them.

At the ECOSOC, which met in May, nine draft resolutions and four draft decisions concerning drug control were approved by the Council. Included in the drafts were calls for a drug law enforcement training strategy, a plenipotentiary conference, and additional resources for the drug fund.

Most of the statements made during the ECOSOC debate expressed concern about the world drug abuse situation and noted the need for increased international cooperation to combat drug abuse and illicit trafficking. Speaking for the United States, regarding the new convention, Assistant Secretary Wrobleski said,

> A call to action was sounded at the World Conference last June when 138 nations pledged to work together to make this a drug-free world. I can think of few other issues which have united us in such a way; there certainly are few other issues which threaten so many of us, regardless of geography, ideology, economic strength or political power.

Ms. Wrobleski also expressed appreciation for the work of the drug agencies and their efforts to assist in completing the new convention.

COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

The 10th special session of the 40-member Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND)* convened in Vienna from February 5 to 17. Assistant Secretary Wrobleski led the U.S. Delegation, which included representatives of the Departments of State, Justice (including the Drug Enforcement Administration), Health and Human Services, Transportation (U.S. Coast Guard) and Treasury (the U.S. Customs Service). The CND approved nine draft resolutions and three draft decisions which were forwarded for ECOSOC consideration and four resolutions and nine decisions which did not require ECOSOC action.

Draft Convention

The U.S. Delegation played a major role in drafting the CND resolution calling for final preparations for to the Plenipotentiary Conference to complete the new drug trafficking convention. U.S. priorities in crop eradication, interdiction, law enforcement, judical and legal cooperation, were endorsed in the resolution.

---

*Members in 1988 were: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Ecuador, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, Soviet Union, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Zambia. (Terms expire December 1989.) Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Cote d'Ivoire, Denmark, Egypt, Federal Republic of Germany, France, India, Italy, Lebanon, Madagascar, Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Switzerland, Thailand, United States, Yugoslavia. (Terms expire December 1991.)

The CND also adopted a U.S.-sponsored resolution which endorsed a global drug abuse data collection support system. In addition, the CND called on the Secretary General to maintain resources for the drug agencies at 1987 levels and requested individual Commission members to urge the same thing in individual intervention of the United Nations on this issue. Other resolutions and decisions addressed the issues of government and UN coordination, demand reduction, supply reduction, enhanced law enforcement, drug scheduling, the role of nongovernmental organizations and actions recommended by the Commission's subsidiary regional bodies.

Directly after the CND, the third meeting of an experts group was convened to continue progress on the new drug trafficking convention. Also, from June 27 to July 8, a review group met to review Articles 1 to 6 specifically, and other articles as necessary, and to consider organizational and procedural matters relating to the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Drug Scheduling

An ongoing responsibility of the CND is to place narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances under the international control provisions of the two international drug control conventions. In 1988 the CND voted for control, in Schedules I and IV of the Single Convention, of three fentanyl analogues (alpha-methylfentanyl, acetyl-alpha-methyl fentanyl and 3-methylfentanyl) and two meperidine analogues MPPP (1-methyl-4phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine) and PEPAP (1-(2-phenethyl)-4-phenyl-4-acetyloxypiperidine)). Methamphetamine racemate and secobarbital were voted for control in Schedule II of the Psychotropic Convention. The U.S. Delegation voted in favor of each approved scheduling decision.

Other CND Action

The U.S. Delegation played a large role in drafting the CND resolution which called for specific actions in follow-up to the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking (ICDAIT). U.S. priorities in the areas of demand reduction, supply reduction (including crop eradication), trafficking interdiction and treatment and rehabilitation, were endorsed in the resolution. Governments, international organizations and nongovernmental organizations were all singled out to take targeted, appropriate actions within the next year.

UN DRUG CONTROL AGENCIES

Ms. Margaret Joan Anstee (U.K.) continued to serve as Coordinator of UN Drug-Related Activities, while serving as Director General of the UN Office at Vienna. Ms. Anstee is responsible for overseeing and coordinating the major issues related to the UN drug agencies.

The UN Division of Narcotic Drugs (DND) carried out a program of activities which emphasized the provision of practical, technical and scientific assistance to member states. In addition, the DND worked extensively in facilitating the drafting of the new convention and in continuing follow-up to ICDAIT. Francisco Ramos-Galino (Spain) continued to serve as the DND Director. During the CND session, the Division received praise for convening expert groups and preparatory work for the anti-trafficking convention.

The UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), under the leadership of Executive Director Guiseppe Di Gennaro (Italy), continued to expand its program activities during 1988. A total of 101 sectoral projects were undertaken in 40 countries. The growth in financial resources made available to the Fund enabled UNFDAC to enlarge its opium control programs in South West Asia as well as to mount large coca control operations, at the Andean Sub-region level, in Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. During 1988 UNFDAC increased its activities in the Near and Middle East and started a major multi-sectoral program of cooperation with India, in addition to a drug control program in China. By year-end, nearly 20 projects in various stages of development were underway in Africa.

As a concrete demonstration of government endorsement of UNFDAC and its work, 60 countries pledged and/or contributed $90.3 million in 1988. The United States pledged $3 million. According to UNFDAC estimates, the Fund spent approximately $31.1 million in 1988. These monies went for crop replacement/agricultural development, research and drug law enforcement preventive education and information, treatment and rehabilitation of dependent persons. A sizable amount of the pledges was intended for implementation in future years. The United States continued to play a leadership role in guiding the work of the Fund. Rapid expansion of UNFDAC's activities was expected to continue and the Fund remained a key multilateral tool in the global struggle against the drug problem. At the 1988 CND, the United States announced a planned special contribution, through UNFDAC to strengthen the DND and the INCB's ability to carry out mandated functions.

The 1988 report of the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) offered an assessment of the general trends in trafficking, abuse and licit and illicit production. In his overview of the 1988 INCB Report, the Board President Shaibyada Ali Kahn (Pakistan), stressed the need to bring to justice the criminal networks of individuals involved in the illicit production, manufacture and distribution of narcotic and psychotropic substances. To aid the situation, he expresses hope that the new anti-trafficking convention would be brought into force at an early date.

The Board's report also emphasized the toll that drug abuse can take not only on society and its productivity, but on the environment as well. The method of slash-and-burn to clear land for illicit cultivation was cited as causing extreme damage to the land and causing soil erosion. The poisoning of drinking water systems resulting from the dumping of toxic chemicals used in coca paste production was cited as another serious problem. Ann B. Wrobleski, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotic Matters and U.S. Delegate to the CND, applauded the Board's report and its work.

In 1984 the UN General Assembly had determined that a new multinational convention should be prepared which addressed various aspects of narcotics trafficking, in particular those not envisioned in existing agreements.

In 1986 the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) adopted a resolution recommending 14 points for inclusion in the initial draft of a new convention. These 14 points, largely developed by U.S. negotiators, were intended to address all facets of illicit narcotics trafficking, and include, among other things, provisions for crop eradication, forfeiture of narcotics proceeds and instrumentalities, regulation of precursor chemicals, extradition of drug traffickers, and increased cooperation for suppression of high seas trafficking.

Until completion of the new convention, control of the illicit production, trafficking and use of drugs internationally was governed by two major treaties: The 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (as amended in 1972), which is an amalgamation of many earlier treaties dating back to 1909, and the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances. These conventions established the basic principles used to monitor and control all the major natural and manufactured substances commonly known as drugs of abuse.

As abuse problems expanded in recent times, to affect all regions of the world and almost all countries, the global law enforcement/interdiction community came to realize that the existing treaties would be enhanced by universal agreement on stronger and broader measures for cooperative law enforcement to control illicit traffic. In this climate, nations greatly affected by the burgeoning drug trade (especially the United States and countries in Latin America) began to call for more forceful action by the United Nations and its specialized agencies. At the 1984 UN General Assembly, Venezuela proposed the preparation of a new anti-drug trafficking convention to be negotiated in Vienna under the supervision of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Over the subsequent 4 years, legal and law enforcement experts from several countries, including the United States, prepared a draft text of a new convention.

The United States took a very active role in the development of the draft convention. It was a priority to the U.S. interests to negotiate a strong convention, one that went beyond the existing conventions' few provisions on trafficking and obligated parties to take affirmative steps against drug trafficking.

CONFERENCE FOR PLENIPOTENTIARIES FOR THE ADOPTION OF A CONVENTION AGAINST ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

Following the 4 years of meetings and negotiations, a Conference for Plenipotentiaries for the Adoption of a Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances was convened in Vienna, Austria, from November 25 to December 20. The Conference was attended by representatives of 106 countries, as well as most international agencies and a large number of nongovernmental organizations concerned with the drug issue.

The U.S. Delegation achieved its major goals and objectives for the conference. Assistant Secretary Wrobleski served as head of delegation. Ambassador Michael Newlin, the United States Permanent Representative to the UN Agencies in Vienna, served as alternate head of delegation. Officials from the Departments of State, Justice (including the Drug Enforcement Agency), Treasury, (including the U.S Customs Service), and Transportation, (including the U.S. Coast Guard), and Interpol served on the delegation.

In preparation for the Plenipotentiary Conference, a Group of Experts met directly following the 1988 February CND to work on the convention and a Review Group was convened in June/July 1988 to work on substance as well as organizational and procedural matters. This Group further reviewed a draft text of the Convention and completed the draft Rules of Procedure.

The Conference opened on November 25 with the election of officers and the establishment of two committees of the whole. Director General Margaret Anstee, representing the UN Secretary General, reviewed the history of drug control conventions and treaties and paid tribute to the CND, heads of state and first ladies. She noted the important recognition of shared responsibility achieved at ICDAIT and discussed the technical and law-enforcement mechanisms which should be included in the new convention. She stressed the Secretary General's personal commitment to an effective convention.

The following were elected by consensus: President, Guillermo Bedregal-Gutierrez (Bolivian, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Worship); Chairman Committee I, Gioacchino Polemini (Italy); Chairman Committee II, Istvan Bayer (Hungary); Chairman Drafting Committee, M.V.N. Rao (India); and Rapporteur-General, Mervat El Tallawy (Egypt). The U.S. Delegate was elected as one of the 24 vice presidents.

During the opening session, Director General Margaret Anstee read a message to the Conference from President and Mrs. Reagan. In the statement, which was well received, the President stated,

> We [Nancy and I] wholeheartedly join all of you in underscoring the importance of completing a strong new convention which will enhance our shared efforts to control illicit

> international trafficking in drugs. It is especially encouraging for us to note that there is a common understanding between nations that a multilateral treaty, designed to counter drug trafficking, is a necessary complement to existing international agreements.

The main purpose of plenary sessions was to hear statements by government ministers and to adopt decisions of the committees. Substantive discussions of specific articles of the convention were done in the two main committees of the whole.

The December 18 plenary adopted two resolutions and the Final Act of the Conference. The major resolution invited states to provisionally apply the measures included in the convention, pending its entry into force. Another resolution focused attention on the value of Interpol. The Final Act, a standard legal document prepared for participants' signature at the signing ceremony, was accepted by consensus.

On December 19 the plenary reconvened to consider the completed draft text of the convention, as submitted by the drafting committee. After reports by the committees, the participating countries rapidly adopted the convention by consensus, as well as one last resolution, which focused on the resource needs of the drug control agencies. When the convention was opened for signature on December 20, a total of 97 states signed the Final Act, and of this group, 43 signed the convention.

Under Secretary Anstee opened the signing ceremony by reading a message from Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, affirming that drug control is one of the top priorities of the United Nations. He praised the convention and called on countries to sign and ratify it quickly. Ms. Anstee said she was pleased that a strong convention had been adopted through a process of consensus but without settling for a "least common denominator" text, a position which was first enunciated by the U.S. Delegation.

Attorney General Dick Thornburgh came to Vienna to sign the convention for the United States. The Attorney General said the new convention was an instrument that could break the traditional pattern of drug traffickers and that it provided new tools for law enforcement officials to more effectively carry out their responsibilities. He stated,

> Our collective contributions—the sum of our efforts—hold great promise for future generations. Ratification and full implementation of this convention, could give our children, and their children, the gift of a world cleansed of the scourge of drug abuse, a world where governments carry out their responsibilities free of the corrupting influence of drug profiteers, a world where the vicious criminals now in control of transnational drug cartels are behind bars, their networks in ruins and their illicit profits plowed back into more effective law enforcement.

The new convention contained many U.S.-sponsored obligatory and discretionary cooperation requirements on states parties and established multilateral law enforcement commitments previously achieved only through bilateral agreements.

U.S. spokesmen said the treaty sent a clear message to governments and drug traffickers that there is a collective, global commitment to exposing and ending drug trafficking throughout the world. They said that since the United States had played a key role in preparing this convention, the United States could claim it as a major victory in the war against drugs. Observers said the United Nations, which organized the drafting process and sponsored the Conference, could also claim credit for this significant addition to the international legal and law enforcement framework.

Under the new convention extensive cooperative bilateral arrangements will be supplemented by agreement among states parties to the convention, both to supplement state-to-state measures, where they exist, and to provide new bases for cooperation where they are lacking. These cooperative measures include the following:

Mutual Legal Assistance. Judicial and law enforcement agencies will exchange evidence for use in the arrest, prosecution and conviction of criminals who commit a drug crime in one country and reside in another, even though they might be a citizen of a third country.

Seizure of Illicit Profits. Financial profits, real estate, possessions and other traffickers' assets in various countries can be identified, traced, seized and confiscated for the benefit of the countries affected. Before the convention, international criminals could rely on bank secrecy and other legal measures to protect their assets. Under the convention, bank secrecy in such cases should end. Although international traffickers have often kept their assets in a number of countries in order to absorb heavy legal costs and to accumulate vast wealth, the convention requires countries to enact laws to confiscate criminally gained assets.

Money laundering. Major traffickers must process vast sums of cash profits. The new convention requires all states parties to make money laundering a crime. Law enforcement officials will be able to punish those who help move money for traffickers as well as identify the traffickers themselves.

Extradition. The new convention assures that drug trafficking and money laundering are crimes for which criminals will be extradited and helps assure their full prosecution.

Controls on Commercial Carriers. The convention focuses on the involvement of commercial transportation as an important element in the trafficking chain. It obligates owners of commercial carriers to prevent illicit traffickers from using their facilities, and it urges governments to enlist private port authorities in the fight against drug trafficking.

Control of Chemicals used to Manufacture Illicit Drugs. International trade in previously unmonitored chemicals, equipment and other materials used in the clandestine manufacture of drugs will be carefully watched when they are shipped and received. This represents a new collaboration between industrialized states where these "precursor" chemicals usually are made and developing states, where many of them are used in the illicit manufacturing and processing of drugs.

Crop Eradication. This provision states explicitly that parties to this convention shall not take measures regarding crop eradication any less stringent than those measures required of states parties to the 1961 Single Convention, its 1972 Protocol and the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances.

Law Enforcement Cooperation. The Convention establishes for the first time that bilateral or multilateral cooperation is essential in almost all areas of legal and law enforcement activity related to drug trafficking. It will enable and encourage foreign prosecutors and law enforcement officials to deal directly and effectively with their counterparts in the United States and elsewhere.

High Seas Interdiction. The new convention enhances cooperation among states parties to encourage boarding, search and seizure of vessels transporting illegal drugs on the high seas.

Free Trade Zones and Free Ports. The Convention extends to free trade zones and free ports law enforcement measures previously used in domestic efforts to suppress illicit traffic. These include surveillance systems, monitoring of the movement of goods and persons, and the searching of cargo, vessels and persons in free trade zones and free ports.

Use of the Mails. This convention provides effective measures and a legislative framework within which parties can aggressively suppress the use of the mails for illicit trafficking.

Controlled Deliveries. The Convention calls on all parties to allow the use of controlled delivery across international borders. This serves to locate the intermediate and ultimate recipients of drug shipments by allowing transportation to proceed under surveillance.

UN Involvement. Monitoring implementation of the new convention will be the responsibility of the International Narcotic Control Board (INCB), with policy oversight provided by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND). This is the case for the two existing conventions.

Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator

Problems of uncoordinated relief efforts in a series of major disasters in the late 1960s convinced members of the United Nations that a distinct office was needed to help organize the emergency assistance which individual governments, UN agencies, the Red Cross and other voluntary societies provide. In March 1972 the UN Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO), subsequently renamed the Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, was established to mobilize relief more rapidly; coordinate it more systematically; and reduce waste, duplication and failure in the supply of essential items. UNDRO was also given responsibility for improving contingency planning and disaster preparedness worldwide and for harnessing modern scientific and technological knowledge to prevent and mitigate disasters.

UNDRO's mandate is three-fold: to mobilize, direct and coordinate relief activities among organizations of the UN system; to assist governments of stricken countries to assess relief needs, disseminate that information and coordinate donors responses; and to promote disaster prevention and preparedness activities. Disaster relief coordination is the core of the activities of UNDRO and receives the highest priority in the allocation of resources.

The Geneva-based organization is headed by the UNDRO Coordinator, who holds the rank of Under Secretary General and reports directly to the UN Secretary General. The Coordinator's term is normally coterminous with that of the UN Secretary General. The current UNDRO Coordinator is M'hamed Essaafi of Tunisia. UNDRO also maintains a liaison office in New York.

UNDRO does not have a governing body, and thus has no formal meetings *per se*. As an ECOSOC organization, UNDRO matters are discussed biennially. They were discussed at the 1988 ECOSOC summer session and at the 43rd General Assembly.

In 1988 UNDRO played an active role in coordinating relief efforts throughout the world where natural disasters occurred. In the fall of 1988, UNDRO Coordinator Essaafi was named the UN Secretary General's Special Representative for the Emergency in Bangladesh and headed an interagency mission to assess immediate and short-term relief needs, reconstruction requirements, as well as the work on donor coordination. Throughout the year under review, UNDRO was asked to respond to relief needs in a number of countries, including:

— Benin, Brazil, Chad, Peru, the Sudan, Rwanda, Burkina Faso (floods and landslides);
— Costa Rica, Haiti, Jamaica, Nicaragua, the Philippines (hurricanes and typhoons);
— Nepal, Venezuela (earthquakes and landslides); and
— Djibouti, Somalia, Algeria (drought).

Since 1984–1985, continued emergency situations in Africa have engaged UNDRO's attention. Prolonged destabilization and consequent displacement of civilians—notably in the Sudan, Ethiopia, Mozambique and

Angola— coupled with flooding, locust infestations and crop failures, created an urgent need for food assistance, medical supplies and other types of relief assistance. UNDRO cooperates closely with many organizations in the UN system and other intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations involved in humanitarian relief. It has established and reinforced national focal points for disaster management information.

In the area of disaster preparedness and prevention, UNDRO participates in and cosponsors studies, seminars, missions and projects concerning *inter alia* seismic risk reduction, disaster mitigation, information systems development, tropical cyclones, mudflow prevention and disaster management training. It also has fellowships in preparedness training, which are financed by voluntary contributions from governments.

In response to various Assembly resolutions and decisions, at the July 1988 ECOSOC session in Geneva the Secretary General reported on disaster-related activities and on the work and activities of UNDRO for the 2 years 1986–1987. The report noted that for the biennium 1988–1989 UNDRO's work and activities would be guided by relevant General Assembly resolutions, and also covered the strengthening links between UNDRO headquarters and UNDP resident representatives, who represent UNDRO in the field.

The UNDRO Coordinator cited the often long-lasting effect of natural disasters on economic development, the need for speed in responding to disasters and UNDRO's achievements, notwithstanding its relatively small staff. He also commented on UNDRO's collaboration with FAO in the fight against locusts in Africa, and its role in the airlift operation to provide relief food assistance to parts of Ethiopia.

The Coordinator called attention to a growing number of requests from developing countries for disaster assistance, and reported that some 30 projects related to disaster mitigation in all regions of the world are in various stages of implementation with UNDRO assistance. He mentioned that much of the disaster management community is now actively using UNDRONET. (UNDRONET, subsequently renamed UNIENET, is an information network, for which U. S. AID provided technical assistance. It allows disaster managers around the world to have direct access to each other and provides them with instant disaster-related information.)

On UNDRO's contribution to activities related to an international decade for disaster reduction, the Coordinator said that UNDRO would provide assistance for the preparation of the Secretary General's reports to the 43rd and 44th General Assemblies.

Looking ahead, the UNDRO Coordinator said four important issues require attention:

— the need for quicker response to disasters. (He said that the UNDRO supply depot at Pisa, Italy, would help UNDRO take immediate steps);

— action at the local level to engage in disaster prevention and preparedness efforts;

— the need for more staff to enable UNDRO to collect and process information; and

— the need for increased resources. (According to the Coordinator, UNDRO's regular budget is being reduced at a time of increasing relief obligations and when UNDRO has new obligations to fulfill in maintaining its electronic mail network (UNIENET) and anticipates an increased prevention and preparedness role under the proposed disaster reduction decade.)

During the debate, developed countries supported closer UNDRO/UNDP collaboration and efforts to strengthen work in this area. Developing country delegations praised UNDRO for an effective response to disasters, called for increased resources to UNDRO and cited its coordination with FAO in the fight against locusts in Africa, flood assistance in Bangladesh in June 1987 and the increased and rapid dissemination of information on disaster occurrences worldwide.

In resolution 1988/51, the ECOSOC *inter alia* emphasized the need to keep UNDRO on a sound financial basis and urged positive and expeditious responses to the Secretary General's appeals for contributions to the UN Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance; urged further efforts to facilitate the integration of disaster prevention projects in the planning of national programs and welcomed practical steps of UNDP and UNDRO to improve their cooperation with governments and voluntary agencies. The Secretary General was requested to include information on the implementation of the present resolution in his next biennial report on UNDRO, which is to be submitted to the 45th General Assembly through ECOSOC in 1990.

The Secretary General's report to the 43rd General Assembly on the implementation of Assembly decision 42/433 (concerning the reform and strengthening of UNDRO) indicated that the Advisory Management Service would be requested to assist in adjusting UNDRO's work program and organization to reflect an orientation on sudden natural disasters and on preparation and prevention measures, and that a study was in process. As an appendix, the Secretary General attached the final report of the UNDRO/UNDP task force established to develop improved modalities for cooperation. That report includes specific recommendations and discusses in detail the cooperative arrangements between organizations in the field. It also notes that UNDRO and UNDP are formulating a work program to implement the recommendations.

During the debate in the Second Committee of the General Assembly (social and economic issues), the United States stated that UNDRO must move firmly and effectively if it is to fulfill its primary mandate and meet increasing challenges in responding to a steadily increasing number of requests for disaster assistance. At a time of general budgetary stringency, it must strengthen its capacity and seek to manage its resources, both personnel and financial, in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

The United States further noted its continued belief that UNDRO's effectiveness would be enhanced were its headquarters staff reduced and were UNDRO to become more field-oriented in its operations and staff assignments. UNDRO's primary focus must be on the increasing number of natural disasters to which it is called upon to respond. In this regard, the United States stressed that any UNDRO role in preparatory work in conjunction with an international decade for disaster reduction must not impinge upon, or distract from, fulfillment of UNDRO's disaster coordination mandate.

DECADE FOR NATURAL DISASTER REDUCTION

In response to resolution 42/169, the Secretary General submitted a progress report that *inter alia* discussed the "catalytic and facilitating" role envisaged for the United Nations in conjunction with the General Assembly decision in the referenced resolution to designate the 1990s "as a decade in which the international community, under the auspices of the UN, would pay special attention to fostering international cooperation in the field of natural disaster reduction." Among the actions cited were:

— in February 1988, the establishment of a steering committee, composed of senior officials of the UN system, on the decade to assist in developing an appropriate framework for its goals and objectives;

— the convening in March, by the United Nations, in cooperation with the U.S. National Academy of Sciences (U.S. NAS), of an informal meeting of international scientists, engineers and representatives of the UN system to discuss the decade; and

— the Secretary General's appointment of an international *ad hoc* group of 25 experts, under the Chairmanship of Dr. Frank Press, President of the U.S. NAS, to assist in developing an appropriate framework for the decade. The group is to submit its report to the 44th General Assembly through ECOSOC.

The report noted UN suggestions for possible actions by national committees and covered cooperation between nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations. It took note of funding received from several governments and assistance provided by the U.S. NAS, and said any need for resources beyond existing resources would be stated in the final report.

The report cited the UN system's role in inspiring and supporting decade-related activities and called for the United Nations to become an international center for the exchange of information, storage of documents and coordination of international efforts. It said that some UN entities have long been involved in the study and prevention of natural disasters, and concluded that pending agreement on an appropriate framework it was not possible to define a more specific UN role.

The General Assembly adopted, by consensus, resolution 43/202 in support of decade-related activities, and requested the Secretary General to submit a report responding to the resolution to the 44th General Assembly.

UN High Commissioner for Refugees

The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), organized in 1951, is mandated to provide legal protection and material assistance to refugees and to promote permanent solutions for refugee problems. These responsibilities are carried out on behalf of refugees falling within the scope of the Statute of the Office adopted by the General Assembly in 1950. In general, the Statute applies to those persons who are outside their country of nationality because they have a well-founded fear of persecution by reason of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion and, because of such fear, are unable or unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of the government of that country. The term of the current High Commissioner, Jean-Pierre Hocke (Switzerland), expires December 31, 1991.

The Executive Committee of the UNHCR meets annually in Geneva to review the work of the UNHCR and approve the budget. At this meeting, the UNHCR advises the Executive Committee on any special activities. The U.S. Representative at the 39th session of the Executive Committee, held October 3–10, was Mr. Jonathan Moore, U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and Ambassador-at-Large.

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL PROTECTION

The basic legal mechanisms for the protection of refugees are the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which is restricted to persons who became refugees as a result of events occurring before 1951, and the 1967 Protocol, which removes the time limit on eligibility. The United States is a party to the Protocol. States acceding to these international instruments accept provisions explicitly prohibiting the return of a refugee, in any manner whatsoever, to any country in which his life or freedom would be threatened because of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion. At the same time, however, the refugee has obligations to the country in which he finds himself and is required to conform to its laws and regulations as well as to the measures taken for the maintenance of public order.

The international protection of refugees includes ensuring that they are granted (political) asylum, that those who wish to return voluntarily to their country of origin may do so without penalty for having fled, and that no refugee is forcibly returned to his/her country of origin. The UNHCR also is concerned with providing basic care and maintenance for refugees, including meeting emergency needs, and with protecting the refugees' right to work, to practice their religion, and to receive social benefits under the law.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Eleven resolutions on refugee-related matters were introduced in the Third Committee; eight were related to refugees in Africa, one each to refugees in Asia and Central America, and one to the Office of the High Commissioner. All 11 were adopted by consensus: "International Conference on the Plight of Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons in Southern Africa" (Resolution 43/116), "Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees" (Resolution 43/117), "International Conference on Central American Refugees" (Resolution 43/118), "International Conference on Indo-Chinese Refugees" (Resolution 43/119), "Situation of Refugees in the Sudan" (Resolution 43/141), "Humanitarian Assistance to Refugees in Djibouti" (Resolution 43/142), "Emergency Assistance to Voluntary Returnees and Displaced Persons in Chad" (Resolution 43/143), "Assistance to Refugees and "Returnees in Ethiopia" (Resolution 43/144), "Assistance to Refugees in Somalia" (Resolution 43/147), "Assistance to Refugees and Displaced Persons in Malawi" (Resolution 43/148) and "Assistance to Student Refugees in Southern Africa" (Resolution 43/149).

As it has done consistently in the past, the United States, in conjunction with others, again called for rationalization of the African items by combining a multitude of resolutions into one omnibus resolution. With such a move, we had hoped to avoid duplication of efforts undertaken at the UNHCR Executive Committee, the Third Committee and other UN fora.

In addition to these resolutions, the United States was in support of the General Assembly decision to reelect Jean-Pierre Hocke as UN High Commissioner for Refugees for a further 3-year term of office beginning on 1 January 1989 and ending on 31 December 1991.

In his statement before the Third Committee, the U.S. Representative to the Third Committee, Senator Rudy Boschwitz, focused on the important positive developments which have resulted from UNHCR's careful diplomacy and management reforms. In particular, he praised UNHCR's skillful and painstaking negotiations which have resulted in the scheduling of international conferences on Asian and Central American refugees that will take place in 1989, providing an opportunity for governments of first asylum countries to meet with those of resettlement countries in order to build a consensus on regionally acceptable asylum and resettlement policies. Also of particular note was the crucial role played by UNHCR in arranging for the safe return of refugees from southern Sudan to Uganda and from Honduras to El Salvador.

UNHCR PROGRAMS

In 1988 UNHCR estimated total budget requirements for refugee aid throughout the world to be $497.87 million. This total included $51.54 million for overall allocations and other small amounts which are not reflected in the expenditures indicated below by geographic region. The United States contributed $111.12 million in support of UNHCR calendar year 1988 assistance programs worldwide.

Africa

UNHCR expenditures for programs in Africa totaled $240.05 million in 1988; $168.8 million under General Programs and $71.25 million under Special Programs. In addition to continuing the coordination of the major international relief programs in Malawi, Somalia and Sudan and the emergency operations in the Horn and southern Africa, UNHCR began to implement a program to provide for the repatriation of Namibian refugees in accordance with UN resolution 435. U.S. contributions in support of UNHCR programs throughout the region totaled $60.5 million.

Asia

In 1988 UNHCR programs to assist refugees in Asia totaled $87.98 million; $64.5 million under the General Program and $23.45 million under the Special Program. The United States contributed $13.71 million to the General Program. At the end of 1988, 148,574 refugees occupied UNHCR-supervised camps compared to 135,583 at the end of 1987 (this number does not include the refugees in Refugee Processing Centers).

UNHCR continued to pursue other solutions to the Indochinese refugee problem in Southeast Asia, such as voluntary repatriation, when possible, and the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), by which asylum seekers emigrate legally from Vietnam. In the past year, 10,407 Vietnamese used the ODP to join relatives in the United States, and another 8,127 were resettled through the ODP in other countries.

In 1988 the United States contributed $920,000 in support of the UNHCR and Royal Thai Government cooperative plan to combat pirate attacks on

Vietnamese boat refugees in the Gulf of Thailand and for other rescue-at-sea activities and $250,000 in support of the UNHCR special Lao screening program.

Europe and North America

In 1988 UNHCR programs to assist refugees in Europe and North America totaled $20.84 million. UNHCR programs in Europe primarily assist refugees in transit and those refugees who are awaiting repatriation or permanent resettlement. UNHCR assistance activities in North America are primarily related to counseling services on legal and resettlement issues. In 1988 no U.S. funding was provided in support of these programs.

Latin America

UNHCR expenditures for programs in Latin America totaled $36.33 million in 1988, with its largest programs in Honduras, Mexico and Costa Rica. U.S. contributions in support of programs throughout the region totaled $9.66 million.

Southwest Asia, North Africa and the Middle East

In 1988 UNHCR expenditures for programs in this region totaled $99 million. The largest program in the region, the relief effort for approximately three million Afghans in Pakistan, provides food, shelter, health services, educational and vocational training for the largest refugee population in any country in the world. UNHCR is the lead agency in this major international relief program, which supports the Government of Pakistan's efforts to meet the basic needs of these refugees. Since 1984, in conjunction with the World Bank, UNHCR has focused attention on the importance of increasing the Afghans' self-sufficiency as a means of decreasing the burden they pose for the Government of Pakistan and the international community. The World Bank, in conjunction with the UNHCR, has initiated a series of projects designed to provide refugees with employment opportunities, thus freeing them from dependency on camp life in an asylum country. In addition, the UN Secretary General created the office of the UN Special Coordinator for Afghanistan to coordinate and implement a program for the expected repatriation of millions of Afghan refugees currently outside of Afghanistan. The United States contributed $15.98 million to UNHCR for its Afghan refugee assistance program in Pakistan. In addition, the United States contributed $10 million in support of the UNHCR program in Cyprus.

Social Development

WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION

The 43rd session of the UN General Assembly adopted resolution 43/156, "Improvement of Social Life," by a vote of 130 to 16 (U.S.) with 9 abstentions. The resolution had certain positive elements, reaffirming, for example, that the social aspects and goals of development are an integral part of overall development, and that it is the sovereign right of each state to freely determine and implement appropriate policies for social development within the framework of its development plans and priorities. The United States voted against it, however, because it emphasized the importance of the establishment of the new international economic order. Our Western allies joined us in this negative vote.

AGING

The United States has traditionally taken a leadership role in the United Nations on issues concerning aging and the elderly. At the 43rd session of the General Assembly, the United States cosponsored a resolution entitled "Implementation of the International Plan of Action on Aging and related activities" (43/93), which was adopted by consensus. The resolution reaffirmed the importance of promoting and maintaining global awareness of the aging issue and praised the invaluable contribution of nongovernmental organizations in promoting such awareness.

DISABLED

The United States supports UN programs for the disabled and traditionally cosponsors a resolution on the disabled. At the 43rd session of the General Assembly, the United States helped in drafting the resolution 43/98, "Implementation of the World Program of Action concerning Disabled Persons and the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons." The resolution, adopted by consensus, stressed the equalization of opportunities for disabled persons and included a call for a global conference to be held in 1992 to evaluate the impact of the Decade and consider a second Decade of Disabled Persons.

YOUTH

At the 1988 spring ECOSOC, the United States successfully blocked an unacceptable Romanian youth resolution. We also played a pivotal role at the 43rd session of the General Assembly, working to consolidate four youth resolution drafts into an omnibus text, entitled "Question of Youth." (Resolution 43/94.) The resolution called upon all member states to promote youth employment and enable more young people to obtain appropriate educational and vocational training. It also directed the Secretary General to develop methods to facilitate communication and coordination among member states on youth issues.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH

UN Environment Program

The UN Environment Program (UNEP) was established in January 1973, pursuant to UN General Assembly resolution 2997, implementing recommendations of the UN Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm, June 1972). UNEP stems from a U.S. initiative, and the United States has been an active participant in the program since its inception. UNEP's broad mandate is to catalyze and coordinate environmental activities throughout the UN system and to support efforts by national governments worldwide to deal with environmental and natural resource problems of common interest.

UNEP headquarters are located in Nairobi, Kenya, with regional offices in Bangkok, Geneva, Mexico City, Manama and Washington, D.C. UNEP also maintains an office for the International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals in Geneva and the Industrial and Environmental Office in Paris. Dr. Mostafa Tolba (Egypt), the Executive Director since 1976, and recently reelected to a fourth 4-year term, heads the UNEP Secretariat. UNEP's program and policy oversight body is the Governing Council (GC). It consists of 58 member countries, elected by the General Assembly to 3-year terms and apportioned regionally (16 seats for African States, 13 Asian, 6 Eastern European, 10 Latin American, and 13 Western European and others, including the United States). The GC reports to the UN General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The Governing Council has met biennially since 1987 and is scheduled to hold its 15th regular session in Nairobi, May 15–26, 1989.

UNEP's essential secretariat expenses are financed by the UN regular budget; for 1988–1989, UN regular budget requirements amounted to $10.7 million. A separate Environment Fund, supported by voluntary contributions from member states, provides financing for environmental initiatives undertaken by UNEP. For the 1988–1989 biennium, UNEP's Governing Council approved Fund program activities amounting to $60 million and a reserve fund amounting to $2 million. For 1988 the United States provided the largest share—$7.840 million, or nearly 24 percent—of voluntary contributions paid to the Fund.

GOVERNING COUNCIL

The UNEP Governing Council held its first special session March 14–18, pursuant to UN General Assembly resolution 14/185 of December 11, 1987. The session was attended by 58 members of the Governing Council, 8 UN organizations, 9 UN specialized agencies, 7 intergovernmental organizations, 18 nongovernmental organizations and 4 liberation movements. Credentials of all representatives were accepted without challenge. The principal subject of the special session was the consideration of the System-Wide Medium Term Environmental Program (SWMTEP-II) for 1990–1995.

After careful review of the proposed program, the Council adopted eight decisions, including: (1) approval of the SWMTEP-II, as amended by the special session; (2) a request to the Executive Director to forward amendments to the SWMTEP-II, to the 43rd General Assembly; (3) approval of the UNEP Mid-Term Environment Program (MTP); (4) a request that the Executive Director give priority to regional programs, including the South Pacific and Caribbean Action Plans (three decisions); (5) a determination that the State-of-the-

Environment Report for 1990 should include a report on "Children and the Environment," to be prepared in cooperation with the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF); and (6) a request that the Executive Director report to the 15th session of the Governing Council on efforts of other UN bodies to pursue sustainable development. At the recommendation of the United States, the Council took note of, but did not formally adopt, two other documents related to the SWMTEP II, which were submitted by the Executive Director. These dealt with proposed goals for governments and proposed targets for the UNEP Secretariat to achieve by 1995.

In addition to the resolutions adopted, the special session addressed the issues of climate and climate change, water, terrestrial ecosystems, oceans, human settlements and peace. The special session also considered and approved the UNEP Medium-Term Plan (MTP) and proposed amendments to the environment chapter of the current UN Medium-Term Plan (UNMTP).

The United States stressed the need for SWMTEP and the UNMTP for 1990–1995 to be fully consistent with UNEP and UN resolutions. Continuing a discussion launched at the 14th Governing Council in 1987, the U.S. Delegation also recommended that the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) be considered on an issue-by-issue basis. In a similar vein, the United States argued that issues affecting trade policy should be left to individual governments, rather than mandated by any international body such as UNEP's Governing Council.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

In response to resolutions passed by the 14th regular session of the UNEP Governing Council and the 40th session of the Executive Council of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), in June 1988 WMO established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to be administered by both WMO and UNEP. The Panel was established primarily to achieve three objectives with regard to the threat of global climate change: to review existing data on global climate change, to consider the possible impacts of such change, and to consider possible response strategies. At its first meeting, held in Geneva November 9–11, the Panel created three working groups corresponding to these objectives. The United States was selected to chair the Response Strategies Working Group (RSWG). Chairmen of the other two working groups are the United Kingdom for scientific analysis and the U.S.S.R. for impact analysis. The Panel also elected a chairman (Professor Bert Bolin of Sweden) and five vice chairmen. These individuals, along with the chairmen of the working groups, constitute the Panel's Bureau which will provide direction to the Panel when the full body is not in session.

The Panel decided to present its first report to the Second World Climate Conference, scheduled for June 25–July 3, 1990. The Panel recognized that the planned long-term report would not be completed by that time, but found it preferable to submit an interim report to the conference as scheduled rather than attempt to reschedule the conference.

In addition to establishing the work plan, the Panel also considered a number of other international environment issues, including a draft resolution entitled "Conservation of Climate as Part of the Common Heritage of Mankind" submitted by the Government of Malta. The draft resolution called for a report on climate change to be prepared by the WMO and UNEP Secretariat heads and the IPCC, which would be presented, if ready, to the 11th World Meteorological Congress and the 16th UNEP GC in 1991. Despite U.S. concerns that the report would duplicate other studies, the Panel agreed that each of the Working Groups would prepare a statement for submission to these meetings.

VIENNA CONVENTION AND THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

In addition to its role with the IPCC, UNEP sponsored the negotiation of two important agreements, and served as the interim secretariat for their implementation. The Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer entered into force in September 1988, following ratification by 20 governments. The Montreal Protocol for Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer is expected to enter into force in January 1989 with at least the minimum of 11 ratifications necessary. The United States has signed and ratified both agreements.

TRANSFRONTIER MOVEMENT OF HAZARDOUS WASTE

Several incidents in recent years—especially in Nigeria, Guinea and Haiti—have focused attention on the need for control of the international transport of hazardous waste. UNEP accordingly began work on a global agreement on the subject in 1987. Member governments met in February 1988 to discuss an international convention on hazardous waste shipments, and again in November to prepare a draft of the agreement. Following additional work on the draft early in 1989, a Diplomatic Conference is scheduled to meet in Basel, Switzerland, in March to finish the agreement and open it for signature.

BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

As mandated by another resolution adopted at the 14th regular session of the Governing Council, UNEP initiated work on an umbrella convention to rationalize international efforts in the field of habitat and species protection. UNEP's efforts culminated in the first meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Biological Diversity in Geneva, November 16–18, 1988. Despite encouragement from the United States, other delegations, and the Executive Director of UNEP, the meeting concluded that there was no support for an umbrella convention which would pull together existing legal instruments. However, there was broad support for exploring a new substantive convention. Despite general agreement on the measures and obligations to be included in such a convention, the Working Group decided to take no further action on the matter until the 15th session of the Governing Council.

REGIONAL SEAS

The United States participates actively in the two UNEP regional seas programs which include U.S. territories in the Caribbean and the South Pacific. Following a recommendation made in June 1988 by an Intergovernmental Meeting for the South Pacific Regional Environmental Program (SPREP), a Steering Committee was established to give participating governments a greater role in management of the program. This new body is expected to meet for the first time in March 1989, after which UNEP will consider whether to resume financial support for the effort.

The Caribbean Environment Program is the principal activity conducted under the Cartagena Convention. Under this program, the United States hosted a UNEP-sponsored drafting session to prepare a protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, in October 1988. The second regional meeting to complete the Protocol was scheduled for June 1989. A technical workshop was also planned on land-based sources of pollution.

UNEP IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

UNEP's annual report, submitted through the Economic and Social Council, was accepted without challenge at the 43rd session of the UN General Assembly. The Assembly also reelected Dr. Mostafa Tolba to a fourth term as the Executive Director of UNEP, until December 31, 1992.

UNEP continues to be the principal organ in the UN system for addressing issues of the environment. However, with the growing worldwide interest in this subject, the General Assembly has substantially increased its own activity in the field. In addition to accepting the UNEP annual report, the 43rd General Assembly adopted five other resolutions on the environment. (Resolutions 43/53, 43/75 Q, 43/75 T, 43/196, 43/212.)

UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

The UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR)* was established by the General Assembly in 1955 to provide continuous review and evaluation of the effects of ionizing radiation on humans and their environment. Radiation in this context covers both natural and manmade (i.e., from atmospheric and surface nuclear explosions), environmental radiation, and medical and occupational exposures.

---

*The member states are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Peoples Republic of China, Peru, Poland, Sudan, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and the United States.

Under its terms of reference, the Committee receives, assembles, and compiles reports and information furnished by its member states, members of the United Nations, specialized agencies, the IAEA and nongovernmental organizations on observed levels of ionizing radiation and on scientific observations and experiments relevant to the effects of ionizing radiation on man and the environment.

Since its establishment, the Committee has prepared and submitted to the UN General Assembly six comprehensive reports on the effects of ionizing radiation. In addition to collection and evaluation of the literature on radiation effects, UNSCEAR agreed in 1973 to evaluate the radiological hazards created by the testing activities of one country if asked to do so by a neighboring country which was potentially at risk. To date, no such evaluations have been requested.

The 37th session of UNSCEAR met in Vienna from June 6–17. The U.S. Representative was Fred A. Mettler, Jr., M.D., Professor and Chairman of Radiology at the University of New Mexico. The session was concerned with final consideration of chapters for a 1988 report to the General Assembly on the effects of ionizing radiation. The main text of the report entitled "Sources, Effects and Risks of Ionizing Radiation" was presented to the 43rd session of the General Assembly as supplement No. 45 (A/43/45) 1988. Included were

—exposures from power production
—exposures from medical uses of radiation
—exposures from the Chernobyl accident
—genetic hazards
—radiation carcinogenesis in man
—early effects in man of high doses of radiation and appendix on acute radiation effects in victims of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident.

The 38th session of UNSCEAR scheduled for May 8–12, 1989, in Vienna, will consider topics and outlines for future reports for presentation to the General Assembly.

New and Renewable Sources of Energy

The UN Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy (NRSE) met in New York from March 28–April 8. This was the fourth session of the committee since adoption of the UN Program of Action for New and Renewable Sources of Energy in Nairobi in 1981. An Interim Committee met in Rome in 1982 and discussed the role of the UN system in this field. Four meetings of the NRSE committee have made little progress in mobilizing development efforts in this area.

Although we have a substantial interest in the development of new and renewable energy sources, the United States does not view the United Nations as having a central directive role to play. We prefer to emphasize the importance of bilateral assistance and the private sector. In order to limit the expansion of the UN bureaucracy in this field, the United States opposed the establishment of permanent institutional arrangements for implementing the Nairobi Plan of Action from the outset. A U.S. proposal that follow-up functions be carried out by the already-existing Committee on Natural Resources was rejected by other delegations.

At the fourth session, the United States again noted the disjointed nature of the UN approach to this issue, the need to eliminate duplication in the UN system and the lack of achievement in this area. The U.S. Delegate questioned the need for the Committee and its utility in light of the lack of support from UN members. Although a number of delegations supported the U.S. position, calls for the elimination of the Committee or its merger with the Committee on Natural Resources were rejected by the G-77.

Science and Technology for Development

In 1979 the General Assembly created three bodies to deal with science and technology for development: (1) the Intergovernmental Committee for Science and Technology for Development (IGCSTD) to formulate policy guidelines and identify priorities and activities in this area, which would be open for participation by all UN members; (2) the Center for Science and Technology for Development to coordinate science and technology activities within the United Nations at the Secretariat level and to serve the Intergovernmental Committee; and (3) the voluntarily funded Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development, which the UN Development Program (UNDP) would administer until the end of 1981. The General Assembly gave the Interim Fund permanent status in 1982 as the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development.

In 1982 the General Assembly adopted a resolution designed to keep open the institutional debate on science and technology for development. Although the resolution established long-term financial and institutional arrangements, it left open the difficult questions of the proposed financing plan and the voting arrangements for its Executive Board. These were further negotiated at two sessions of the IGCSTD in 1983. Since attendees could not reach agreement, the Secretary General was asked to undertake consultations with governments on the money issues again and, if he were satisfied that there was sufficient interest, to call a pledging conference. There was insufficient interest among governments, and the Secretary General did not convene the conference.

Each year thereafter, the same issues arose. Member nations expressed insufficient interest, and voluntary contributions sufficient to support proposed activities failed to materialize.

In 1985 the Secretary General and the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development again prepared operating proposals. The proposed system would be closely linked to the operations of the UNDP and would provide for a modest staff. While the United States did not oppose science and technology activity carried out through a separate UN organization, we continued to oppose the establishment of "multilaterally pooled funds" for this purpose. The United States recommended that the United Nations limit its activities to playing a broker's role, bringing together potential projects in developing countries with sources of financing and technology in the developed world, including the private sector.

In the face of declining interest on the part of member governments, in reaching agreement on either the structure or the funding of the Financing System, the UN Director General for Development and International Economic Cooperation prepared recommendations for the Intergovernmental Committee providing for termination of the Financing System and the transfer of its activities and residual resources to a trust fund under UNDP management. (In effect, this proposal would recognize the practical arrangements which had been in place since 1980.)

The Intergovernmental Committee, at its June 2-6, 1986, session, approved the proposals of the Director General. Upon receiving the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee, the UNDP Governing Council in late June, by a unanimous decision: (1) established a trust fund for science and technology for development with effect from January 1, 1987; (2) stipulated that the administrative costs of this new facility would be borne by the fund itself; (3) invited governments which would have contributed to the Financing System to transfer such pledges to the trust fund; (4) urged all governments and the international community as a whole to provide resources to the new fund; and 5) requested the Administrator of UNDP to report to the Council in 1987 on the organizational structure, staffing and budget of the new facility.

Acting upon the decision of the Governing Council, the UN General Assembly, in resolution 41/183, decided to terminate the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development and to transfer its responsibilities and resources to a facility within UNDP entitled "The UN Fund for Science and Technology for Development" (UNFSTD). The Administrator of UNDP, to achieve better coherence in operational and administrative terms, decided to merge the UNDP Energy Office with that of UNFSTD. Each element in this combined office will maintain its separate funding mechanism.

The Ninth Session of the UN Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development (IGC) met at UN headquarters in New York City July 27 through August 7, 1987. The agenda for this biennial meeting included substantive discussion of two issues: the application of science and technology to the study, prevention, monitoring, and combatting of drought, desertification and other natural disasters; and the impact of new and emerging areas of science and technology on the economic growth of developing countries. The Committee also discussed the 1988–1989 work program of the UN Center for Science and Technology for Development and provided substantive guidance to improve its operations.

In light of the decision on the financing system, the United States urged the IGC to take a critical look at its organization of work and to focus its attention on a selected number of issues where it could achieve practical results. For example, the United States proposed the elimination of several agenda items and that the IGC concentrate on one, rather than two, substantive themes at future meetings. We also suggested that more work could be done in understanding better the role of science and technology in economic growth in developing countries. Another suggestion dealt with the examination of government policies which stimulate the development of new technologies and encourage private initiative.

The IGC devoted considerable effort to preparing a set of recommendations for the Special Commission of the Economic and Social Council on the reform of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations. Included in its recommendations to the Center were: promotion of technical innovation in developing countries, strengthening endogenous capacities, formulation of strategies for the advancement of women in the area of science and technology, and harmonization of policies on science and technology within the UN system. Recognizing the inherent change in its status effected by the long debate on a financing system, the IGC dropped from its agenda financing of science and technology activity and the issue of an accompanying bureaucratic mechanism as envisioned by the Vienna Conference. The Committee decided upon a more limited and better focused agenda with more attention to substantive themes. It acknowledged the need to concentrate on its role in policy development and coordination. The IGC advised the Center, in turn, to curtail any fund-raising activities as well as detailed operational activities. The IGC will henceforth develop guidance on policy and priorities for use by the UN Fund for Science and Technology now operating under UNDP aegis.

At the June 1988 UNDP Governing Council in Geneva, UNDP reported that the new arrangement for enhancing the work of UNDP in the fields of science, technology and energy had resulted in administrative cost savings; but that pledges for core resources of the new UNFSTD were low. While there was some debate within UNDP on whether or not to close the Energy Office, the Council decided to approve the Administrator's proposal to close the Energy Office, while maintaining it as a separate sub-account of the Fund in order to receive contributions for energy sector activities. The Council also recommended that the General Assembly consider this issue, including the change of designation of the Fund to the UN Fund for Science, Technology and Energy. The Council affirmed the importance of the Fund as a focal point in the UNDP for assistance in strengthening the national, subregional and regional capacities of developing countries in the management of technological change and invited all governments to increase their pledges to the core resources of the Fund.

In resolution 42/192, the General Assembly took note of the upcoming 10th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Vienna Program of Action on Science and Technology for Development, reaffirming the continuing importance of the Program of Action in providing comprehensive guidance for the work of the UN system in the field of science and technology for development. The General Assembly, in considering and subsequently approving the report of the 9th Session of the IGC, noted that 1989 will mark the 10th anniversary of the adoption of the Program of Action and noted the recommendation of the IGC that the General Assembly observe the commemorative anniversary at its 44th session.

In further consideration of the upcoming anniversary, the General Assembly recalled that the IGC, at its 10th session, will carry out an end-of-decade review of the implementation of the Vienna Program of Action, bearing in mind that the preparations for this review constitutes a challenge and an opportunity to contribute to a forward-looking strategy for incorporating science and technology in the development process, reaffirmed the crucial role of the United Nations in promoting and catalyzing international cooperation in the field of science and technology for development, in particular in developing countries, and in helping solve global scientific and technological problems. The General Assembly also decided, in addition to the commemorative observance at its 44th session, that the general debate on the question will be conducted in Plenary.

UN University

The UN University (UNU), founded in 1973, is a non degree-conferring postgraduate institution that coordinates studies on a range of issues of significance to the United Nations. While not convinced of the need for the UNU as a separate institution, the United States recognizes the usefulness of some of its activities such as coordinating world-wide research on nutrition, energy and development. The United States played no role in the UN University during 1988.

University for Peace

At the 35th session of the UN General Assembly in 1980, the United Nations joined the consensus approving the establishment of the University for Peace. The United States did not sign the International Agreement which was annexed to the resolution because we believed that support of existing institutions already working in the field of peace research would be a more efficient use of resources. Moreover, the United States considered it important that any new institutional arrangements for the University not divert resources from existing institutions nor impose any new funding requirements upon UN member states.

The United States continues to have reservations about the capacity of the University for Peace to acquire the funding base and academic infrastructure necessary to make a sustained academic contribution to high-level analysis of peace issues. As a government, the United States played no role in the University for Peace during 1988.

UN Institute for Training and Research

BACKGROUND AND STRUCTURE

The UN General Assembly established the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in 1965 as a result of a U.S. initiative embodied in Assembly resolutions in 1962 and 1963. UNITAR is an autonomous UN institution that was established with the intent of enhancing the effectiveness of the structure and function of the UN system by means of training delegates to the United Nations in the operation of the UN system, its governing bodies and the issues it addresses, as well as through research on the UN system and issues.

Headquartered in New York, UNITAR has a liaison office in Geneva. A Board of Trustees provides policy guidance and direction. The Board is composed of no less than 11, nor more than 30, members appointed by the UN Secretary General, in consultation with the Presidents of the General Assembly and the ECOSOC, including four *ex officio* members: the UN Secretary General, the President of the General Assembly, the President of the ECOSOC and the UNITAR Executive Director. In 1988 the Board of Trustees consisted of 20 appointed members, who serve in their personal capacities and not as formal representatives of governments. Succeeding Alan Keyes, whose term expired in December 1987, former Ambassador Lawrence Eagleburger was appointed in September 1988 to represent the United States on the Board of Trustees.

UNITAR is managed by an Executive Director, who is appointed by the UN Secretary General after consultation with the Board of Trustees. Incumbent Executive Director Michel Doo Kingue has directed UNITAR since January, 1983.

At the time of UNITAR's establishment, the UN General Assembly directed that it be wholly dependent upon voluntary contributions. In 1980 and 1981, however, the General Assembly began giving UNITAR financial assistance, and in those years made up UNITAR's budget deficits with "grants-in-aid." In 1983, UNITAR again ran a budget deficit, and over the strong objections of the United States, the 38th General Assembly awarded UNITAR an "advance" of up to $886,000 on a "non-recurrent, reimbursable basis," to be repaid in installments of about $100,000 annually beginning in 1986. UNITAR's financial problems continued, and a resolution (39/177) passed by the 39th General Assembly in 1984 granted UNITAR an additional $1.5 million, on an exceptional basis, to supplement funds raised through voluntary contributions to the General Fund.

In response to this action, the United States reduced its pledge to UNITAR for 1985 by an amount equivalent to the U.S. proportionate share of the grant or $375,000.

As a result of the inability of UNITAR and the General Assembly to resolve UNITAR's long-term financial problems in 1985 within UNITAR's mandate, the United States in 1986 ceased making a pledge to UNITAR. It was also that year that the United States publicly announced the view—which it continues to hold—that UNITAR's functions do not justify its continuation as a separate institution. It recommended that UNITAR be closed and its training function be placed elsewhere within the UN system.

The 41st General Assembly decided to give UNITAR another chance, however, and it adopted by consensus a resolution (41/172) calling for a restructuring of the Institute over a 3-year period (1987–1989). The resolution also requested the Secretary General to take steps in 1987 to close UNITAR should sufficient funding not be forthcoming.

UNITAR IN 1988

The Board of Trustees held its 26th regular session from April 11–15 in New York. The Board was informed of the effect of the restructuring on UNITAR programs and personnel, and of the status of efforts to sell UNITAR's headquarter's properties in order to repay the Institute's debt to the UN system and establish a reserve for UNITAR with the remaining balance. The report on UNITAR's financial situation revealed continued difficulties and dim prospects for improvement in the future. The Board considered the Institute to be in a transitional phase. It therefore decided to examine issues raised by the UN Secretary General—such as the need for a bold reassessment and refocusing of UNITAR programs, the impact of UNITAR research activities as they relate to other UN bodies, with a view to better coordination of such activities—at its April 1989 session. The hope was that by the next regular Board session, UNITAR's financial situation and future prospects would be clearer. The Board also reviewed UNITAR activities in 1987, approved the program of work for 1988 and 1989, and approved a 1988 budget of $1.069 million taking into account UNITAR's troubled financial situation. The Board urged the Executive Director to continue to manage the institution with austerity and to settle outstanding financial liabilities with the United Nations in 1988, if possible.

On the eve of the 43rd General Assembly's consideration of UNITAR, the Executive Director called a special session (September 13) of the Board of

Trustees. The original agenda had two main items: the financial situation of UNITAR by mid-1988 and changes proposed in the UNITAR rules of procedure, but the latter item was deferred until the regular spring 1989 session of the Board. The Board discussed UNITAR's financial situation without taking any specific action. It also deferred until its spring 1989 session the Executive Director's request to use project support income to increase UNITAR's authorized staffing levels instead of covering its budget shortfall. The Board requested that the Executive Director, at the spring 1989 session, report on how UNITAR was functioning under its new staffing table, and that a written report be provided on the status of negotiations concerning the purchase of land and sale of the UNITAR property.

In response to the requirements of UN resolutions 41/172 and 42/197, the Secretary General reported to the 43rd General Assembly on implementation of the restructuring effort and other developments affecting UNITAR's future. Calling 1988 "essentially a year of transition" for UNITAR, the report concluded that UNITAR programs were being revamped, its staffing altered, and that, notwithstanding the tightest financial constraints, the Institute was able to carry out training activities at a reduced level. It added, however, that delays in the completion of the sale of the UNITAR headquarters building beyond the first half of 1989 would have adverse consequences on the restructuring effort and that a further decline in government contributions could bring UNITAR's work funded through the General Fund to a virtual standstill.

During the general debate in the Second Committee (economic and social issues), the United States noted that the absence of positive responses by donors to requests for financial resources for UNITAR provided further evidence of its marginal usefulness as now constituted and operated; cited the absence of provision in the 1988 budget to repay the advance the General Assembly had previously approved, and stated that the UNITAR report should have been considered by the ACABQ and the UN's Fifth Committee even though UNITAR was financed by voluntary contributions. The United States observed that information available to the Second Committee concerning the purchase of land under the UNITAR building and sale of the entire property as authorized by the General Assembly appeared inadequate, and said proposed amendments to UNITAR's statute and matters related to full-time senior fellows required further consideration by UNITAR's Board of Trustees. The United States asserted that it was time to really restructure UNITAR or terminate its activities and redistribute its training programs to other units in the UN system.

While some member states expressed support for UNITAR and its restructuring effort, others *inter alia* also expressed concern about UNITAR's long-term financial outlook and its response to the restructuring requirement. It was noted that UNITAR had failed to reestablish the confidence of major donor countries and that since 1986 over 20 traditional donors had ceased to make pledges because of disappointment with UNITAR's operation.

At the conclusion of the debate, the Second Committee adopted, without vote, a resolution (43/201) that *inter alia* noted that the 1988 UN Pledging Conference did not provide UNITAR's General Fund with resources required to maintain a minimum training program and institutional structure, requested that UNITAR's 1989 budgetary proposals be submitted to the ACABQ for review and comment prior to approval by its Board of Trustees; and urged the Secretary General to proceed as rapidly as possible with the acquisition of land and subsequent sale of UNITAR's headquarters property. The Secretary General was requested to submit a report to the next UNITAR Board of Trustees meeting on his efforts to do so. In the event necessary financing for UNITAR operations during the first half of 1989 was not assured, the resolution further requested the Secretary General to present specific recommendations on the future of UNITAR, together with detailed financial information, to the 44th General Assembly. The Secretary General was also requested to report to the 44th General Assembly on implementation of the resolution, which was subsequently adopted by the 43rd General Assembly. (Resolution 43/201.)

HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

The principal human rights organ of the United Nations, the Commission on Human Rights (UNHRC), held its 44th annual session February 1 to March 11. The U.S. Delegation was headed by Armando Valladares, the U.S. Representative to the Commission. ECOSOC subsequently considered the Commission's report at its first regular session in New York from May 3–27. Finally, the General Assembly's 43rd session, held from September 20 to December 22, considered a lengthy agenda of human rights issues. The 40th session of the Commission's expert Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was held from August 8 to September 2. All human rights fora commemorated the 40th Anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (December 10, 1948).

Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Cuba

An intense 2-year international effort spearheaded by the United States came to fruition when the 44th (1988) session of the UN Human Rights Commission decided to send a team to Cuba. The purpose of the visit was to allow the Commission to investigate the numerous allegations of systemic violations of human rights in Cuba. This is the first time action had ever been taken at the United Nations concerning the human rights situation in Cuba. The investigation took place September 16–25.

This unprecedented development was the result of the growing concern of the world community over widespread, credible reports by governments, human rights organizations and private groups of serious human rights violations in Cuba and led to an intense effort by the United States to place Cuba officially on the Commission's agenda.

President Reagan named internationally known human rights activist and poet Armando Valladares head of the U.S. Delegation. Valladares was uniquely qualified to speak about the human rights situation in Cuba having been imprisoned in Cuba's jails for 22 years because he expressed his concerns about the direction in which Castro was leading the country. His 1986 book, *Against All Hope,* was instrumental in bringing to world attention the horrors of life in Cuba's prisons.

Within the U.S. Government, the Executive and Legislative branches cooperated at the highest levels to promote passage of the resolution in the UNHRC. Members of Congress and their staffs from both parties lobbied extensively at the Commission, demonstrating the commitment of the U.S. Government to improving the human rights situation in Cuba. The U.S. Information Agency (USIA) complemented these efforts by facilitating strong media coverage throughout the world of human rights abuses in Cuba. These concerted efforts made it extraordinarily difficult to ignore the reality of life in Cuba.

The consensus vote reached by the Commission was the result of a compromise reached the final day of the session, after Cuba, realizing it would lose an actual vote, agreed to invite the Commission to investigate the situation there. The Commission Chairman, in a formal statement, emphasized that the team would operate under standard UN procedures and would report its findings to the 45th (1989) session of the Commission. The arrangement was confirmed by the first regular session of ECOSOC.

The UN team, known as the Cuba Working Group (CWG) was headed by the Commission Chairman, Ambassador Alioune Sene of Senegal. The team members represented each of the five regional areas. The team members accompanying Ambassador Sene were Ambassador Judith Sefi Attah (Nigeria), Ambassador Todor Ditchev (Bulgaria), Ambassador Jose Ingles (Philippines), Ambassador Michael Lillis (Ireland) and Ambassador Raphael Rivas Posada (Colombia).

The CWG prepared for the investigation in the same manner as UN Special Rapporteurs, including organizing and examining material the UN Human Rights Center in Geneva had received from Governments, Cuban victims and human rights groups from around the world.

During the CWG's visit, the Cuban government attempted to fill the schedule with time consuming protocollary activities and late night briefings. Prisons and other intended showcase sites were spruced up in preparation for the team and some political prisoners were released. However, systemic abuses of human rights continued to take place—as evidenced by reports of repressive actions subsequently taken by Cuban authorities, in violation of promises to the contrary made to the CWG, against human rights activists, some of whom had given evidence to the CWG.

The focusing of international attention on Cuba led to a number of improvements in the area of human rights, such as releasing some political prisoners and allowing them to emigrate, showing limited tolerance for unrecognized domestic human rights groups, implementing some improvements in prison conditions, and permitting internationally recognized human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and the International Committee of the Red Cross, to visit Cuba.

The Chairman's decision requested that the team present the report of its investigation at the 45th (1989) UN Human Rights Commission.

Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance

The right to freedom of religion has been a longstanding U.S. concern within the Human Rights Commission. The United States introduced a resolution during the 44th session of the UNHRC (Resolution 1988/30) calling for an extension of 2 years of the mandates of "thematic" Special Rapporteurs, including the Special Rapporteur on religious intolerance. The adoption without a vote of a resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief" (Resolution 1988/55) marked a victory for Western interests in the Commission. The resolution called upon states to take appropriate measures to combat religious intolerance. The U.S. Delegation made a strong statement deploring religious persecution in the Soviet Union and Iran.

This victory was confirmed by the first regular session of ECOSOC, which adopted by consensus a decision approving the Commission's decision to extend for 2 years the mandate of the Special Rapporteur to examine government actions in all parts of the world which are inconsistent with past UN declarations concerning religious tolerance. (Decision 1988/142.)

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, the subject of the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance was again discussed as a major human rights issue. Ireland introduced a draft resolution which reaffirmed the principles of the 1981 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief and called for an end to religious intolerance. This Irish resolution was adopted by consensus. (Resolution 43/100.)

Human Rights in the Occupied Territories of the Middle East

Following the pattern set since 1968, the Commission on Human Rights once again debated the agenda item entitled "Question of the Violation of Human Rights in the Occupied Arab Territories, Including Palestine" at the outset of the 44th session. The United States vigorously opposed this annual and fruitless debate for its exaggerated and inaccurate rhetoric condemning Israel. The Algerian Delegation put forward a two-part resolution cosponsored mainly by Arab and Communist countries, which contained the annual string of unsupported condemnations of alleged Israeli policies and practices. Part A of resolution 1988/1 passed by a vote of 31 to 8 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. Part B focused upon the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and contained further allegations of Israeli violations. The draft resolution contained one provision which reaffirmed that the Geneva Convention is applicable to all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. In a separate vote on this paragraph, the United States voted in favor but voted against Part B as a whole. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 31 to 1 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions.

A companion resolution, 1988/2, introduced by the representative of Nicaragua and cosponsored by several Arab and Communist countries, dealt with the human rights situation in occupied Syrian territories. This resolution, an almost exact copy of an Indian resolution submitted in 1985, contained numerous objectionable paragraphs, including unsubstantiated allegations against Israel and criticism of the "pro-Israeli position of a Permanent Member of the Security Council," which prevented the Security Council from taking "appropriate measures." This resolution was approved by a vote of 31 to 1 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions.

Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), addressed the UNHRC and was accorded the treatment normally reserved for a Head of State. In protest thereof, the U.S. Delegation left the chamber leaving at the chair a junior member of the delegation.

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, resolutions concerning Israel seemed little more than exercises in propaganda. One resolution (43/58) addressing Israeli practices in the occupied territories was discussed in the Special Political Committee under the agenda item "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories." For a summary of the developments under this agenda item, see page 15.

Racial Discrimination in Southern Africa

The subject of racial discrimination, with the focus on apartheid in South Africa, was prominent on the agendas of both the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly. At the 44th Commission session, racial discrimination and apartheid were considered under a cluster of four agenda items which regularly appear on the Commission's agendas year after year. In the debate, Ambassador Valladares expressed the revulsion the U.S. Government feels towards apartheid. He presented a defense of U.S. policies *vis-a-vis* South Africa and outlined what America was willing to do to end this degrading system. He asked that the U.S. policy of moderation and gradual change be given the time to succeed.

An important goal of the U.S. Delegation was to achieve agreement on at least one draft resolution under the cluster of agenda items which would have recorded the universal condemnation of the apartheid system felt by all delegations and thus could have been adopted by consensus. The U.S. Delegation was able to join consensus on a resolution about the detention of children in South Africa. (Resolution 1988/11.) A resolution concerning the situation of human rights in South Africa, which was based upon the report of the Commission's *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on South Africa (first established by the Commission in 1967) and which contained general condemnations of apartheid, also contained a number of other provisions which the U.S. Government could not accept. Therefore, the United States voted against the resolution. The final vote was 36 to 3 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/9.) Another resolution concerning the situation of human rights in Namibia was adopted by a vote of 34 to 0, with 9 (U.S.) abstentions. The U.S. abstention was predicated on the U.S. role in assisting all concerned parties to arrive at a peaceful, negotiated solution which will facilitate the earliest possible independence for Namibia. (Resolution 1988/10.)

The United States voted against a resolution, another in a long series of resolutions carrying the title, "The adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist regimes in southern Africa." The vote was 32 to 7 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The United States and others rejected provisions of that resolution which condemned various forms of economic activity carried out by Western corporations in South Africa. (Resolution 1988/12.) At the same meeting, the Commission considered a draft resolution under the same title recommended by the Subcommission for adoption by the Commission, which was adopted by a vote of 32 to 7 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/13.) The resolution endorsed the work of its Special Rapporteur on "adverse consequences."

Resolution 1988/14 concerning the implementation of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was approved by a vote of 32 to 1, with 11 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States abstained because the resolution contained provisions equating apartheid with genocide and condemned transnational corporations engaged in legal activities.

Finally, two resolutions relating to the implementation of the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination were adopted without votes. The first extended the mandate of the Special Rapporteur to continue his analysis of the achievements of the First Decade. (Resolution 1988/15.) The second covered the Program of Action for the Second Decade. (Resolution 1988/16.) The United States did not participate in these votes, following its long held policy of nonparticipation in voting on resolutions relating to the Second Decade. The policy of nonparticipation dates from the adoption by the UN General Assembly in 1975 of a resolution equating Zionism with racism.

At the first regular session of ECOSOC, 1988, the situation of human rights in South Africa again figured on the agenda. A resolution was passed on the implementation of the Program of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. (Resolution 1988/6.) For the reasons above, the United States did not participate in the vote. ECOSOC adopted without a vote a resolution condemning the infringement of trade union rights in South Africa. (Resolution 1988/41.) Finally, the second regular session of ECOSOC adopted with a vote of 38 to 2 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions, a resolution condemning transnational corporations operating in South Africa. (Resolution 1988/56.)

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, five resolutions were adopted on items relating to racial discrimination and apartheid which were considered by the Third Committee. The United States again did not participate in the vote on a resolution relating to the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/91.) The resolution contained a number of operative paragraphs encouraging governments to continue supporting the Decade program and endorsing certain measures under that program. The United States abstained on a resolution entitled "The adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to the racist and colonialist regime of South Africa." (Resolution 43/92.) The United States joined consensus on a resolution concerning the torture and inhuman treatment of children in detention in South Africa. (Resolution 43/134.) The United States also joined consensus on a resolution concerning assistance to student refugees in South Africa. (Resolution 43/149.)

Resolution 43/97 concerning the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was approved by a vote of 128 to 1 (U.S.), with 26 abstentions. The U.S. opposition was due mainly to provisions in the resolution equating apartheid with genocide and elaborating the idea that transnational corporations operating in South Africa are committing the "crime of apartheid." A resolution on the status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/95.) A resolution on the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was also adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/96.)

Self-Determination

The right to self-determination retained its place on the agendas of human rights organs in 1988 as one of the most widely discussed of the basic human rights. At its 44th session, the Human Rights Commission adopted five resolutions under this recurring agenda item. A resolution on the denial of human rights in Afghanistan was put forward by the representative of Pakistan. The resolution, which reaffirmed the Commission's concern for the denial of human rights in Afghanistan and called for the immediate removal of foreign troops from Afghan territory, was approved by a vote of 31 (U.S.) to 5, with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/4.)

A draft resolution was again introduced in the Commission dealing with the right of self-determination for Palestine. A number of the resolution's preambular and operative paragraphs were directed specifically against Israel. The French Delegation called for separate voting on one of these paragraphs which accused Israel of acts of genocide against the Palestinians and ascribed to Israel responsibility for the massacres that occurred at the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps in September 1982. This paragraph was retained by a vote of 23 to 11 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was approved by a vote of 30 to 4 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/3.)

A resolution concerning the question of the Western Sahara, sponsored by Sao Tome and Principe with mainly African cosponsors, which spells out procedures and terms for the political solution of the question, was approved by a vote of 27 to 0, with 15 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1988/5.) The question of self-determination for Kampuchea (Cambodia) was addressed in a resolution proposed by the Philippines and cosponsored by other Asian, Western and Latin American delegations. In its principal operative paragraphs, this resolution reaffirmed that the continuing illegal occupation of Kampuchea by foreign forces deprives the people of Kampuchea of the right to self-determination and constitutes the primary violation of human rights in Kampuchea at present. The resolution was approved by a vote of 31 (U.S.) to 7, with 3 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/6.)

The first regular session of ECOSOC passed a supporting decision complementary to UN Human Rights Commission resolution 1988/6. By a vote of 40 (U.S.) to 9, with 2 abstentions, ECOSOC adopted a decision on Kampuchean self-determination proposed by the Philippine and other cosponsors. (Decision 1988/143.) The decision reaffirmed the principal operative paragraphs of Commission resolution 1988/6, expressed grave concern at the severity and scope of attacks on Kampuchean civilians located in Thai refugee camps and requested the Secretary General to report to ECOSOC any further violations of humanitarian principles perpetrated against Kampuchean civilian refugees by foreign occupying troops along the border.

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, two more resolutions concerning the right to self-determination were approved. A general resolution entitled "Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination" declared the Assembly's "firm opposition to acts of foreign military intervention, aggression and occupation, since these have resulted in the suppression of the right of peoples to self-determination and other human rights in certain parts of the world." The resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 43/105.) A much more controversial draft resolution proposed by the African Group contained 46 operative paragraphs featuring numerous provisions directed at the policies of Western states and Israel, both in South Africa and Palestine, and contained a strong call for sanctions against South Africa. The resolution was approved by a vote of 124 to 15 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 43/106.) The issue of mercenaries is also considered by the United Nations under the agenda item of self-determination. The Commission approved a resolution introduced by Nigeria on "The Use of Mercenaries as a Means to Impede the Exercise of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination," by a vote of 30 to 11 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. (Resolution 1988/7.) The United States opposed this resolution, which urged states to prohibit the recruitment, financing, training and transit of mercenaries, as outside the Commission's mandate and duplicative of work being done by the UN General Assembly's Sixth Committee. ECOSOC adopted by a vote of 39 to 12 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions a resolution on "The Use of Mercenaries . . . " endorsing the UNHRC decision to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on Mercenaries. (Resolution 1988/126.) Finally, the UN General Assembly approved by a vote of 125 to 10 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions a resolution on "The Use of Mercenaries . . . " expressing appreciation to the Special Rapporteur for his first report. (Resolution 43/107.)

Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Again in 1988, less developed countries' interest in the economic, social and cultural group of human rights mainly focused on the discussion of a so-called, new human right to development. At its 44th session, the Commission received another progress report from its Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development. A representative of Yugoslavia introduced a draft text urging adoption of its draft Declaration on the Right to Development by the 43rd UN General Assembly. The text was adopted by the Commission by consensus. The U.S. Delegation did not participate in the vote. (Resolution 1988/26.)

Also adopted under the agenda item relating to economic, social and cultural rights was a draft resolution proposed by the German Democratic Republic and other mainly Eastern European cosponsors which generally was designed to heighten the place given to the economic, social and cultural group of rights in the Commission's debates. The draft resolution contained a provision recognizing that the realization of the right to development will promote the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights and operative provisions highlighting the importance of economic rights such as the rights to food, to work and to education and health. The resolution also attempted to link disarmament with the right to development by asserting that monies saved by disarmament could be channeled to developing countries. This resolution was approved by a vote of 23 to 9 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/22.) The United States does not accept the linkage between disarmament and the right to development and believes that disarmament is a topic to be discussed in disarmament fora rather than a human rights forum such as the Commission. The Australian Delegation introduced a resolution on the same subject that passed by consensus. (Resolution 1988/23.) The U.S. Delegation reaffirmed the view that economic, social and cultural progress are the goals of government economic and social policies to be achieved progressively rather than "rights" to be granted immediately.

The U.S. Delegation sponsored a resolution on the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. The resolution urged states, "to provide, where they had not done so, adequate constitutional and legal provisions to protect the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others." The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/18.) As a response to this U.S. initiative, the German Democratic Republic sponsored a resolution on the "impact of property on economic and social development." This resolution called upon states to ensure that property ownership would not impair the enjoyment of human rights and condemned transnational corporations operating in South Africa. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 30 to 11 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/19.)

The Delegation of Yugoslavia carried forward its special interest in the subject of "popular participation in its various forms as an important factor in development and in the full realization of all human rights" by proposing a draft resolution that was procedural in nature, taking note of and requesting comments on a study prepared by the Secretary General on the right to popular participation. The resolution requests the Secretary General to submit a report containing the comments to the 45th (1989) session of the Commission. This resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1988/21.)

The Commission adopted, without a vote, a resolution entitled "Recovery of nations' assets illegally removed by violations of human rights." The resolution, cosponsored by the Philippines and Haiti, requested states to cooperate in the speedy recovery of assets removed from the Philippines and Haiti by the Marcos and Duvalier families. (Resolution 1988/20.) The Commission also adopted a resolution sponsored by Mongolia on the right to adequate housing. The resolution was adopted with a vote of 31 to 0, with 11 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1988/24.) In addition, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution sponsored by Bulgaria on the "promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms as an essential condition for the achievement of social justice for all." (Resolution 1988/25.) Finally, the UNHRC adopted without a vote a resolution sponsored by the Federal Republic of Germany on the right to food. (Resolution 1988/29.)

At its first regular session of 1988, ECOSOC approved decision 1988/128 by consensus. This decision endorsed the Commission's resolution 1988/26 and authorized the convening in January 1989 of the Commission's Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development. ECOSOC also approved by consensus a resolution on the International Covenant on

Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (Resolution 1988/4.) The resolution urged member states to cooperate with the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. ECOSOC also adopted without votes, resolutions on the right to food (Resolution 1988/33), the right to adequate housing (Resolution 1988/43), the achievement of social justice (Resolution 1988/46) and extreme poverty (Resolution 1988/47).

The UN General Assembly considered development issues under the agenda item entitled, "Alternative Approaches and Ways and Means Within the UN System for Improving the Effective Enjoyment of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms." Two resolutions of this title were adopted by votes of 123 to 1 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions (Resolution 43/125) and 135 to 8 with 11 abstentions. The U.S. Delegation did not participate in the latter vote. (Resolution 43/126.) The resolutions outlined "alternative approaches" for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights based on the inalienable right to development to be achieved by a "new international economic order" including the transfer of resources brought about by disarmament from developed to developing countries. In addition, the Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution on the right to development calling for assistance to developing countries as part of a so-called right to development. (Resolution 43/127.) The U.S. Delegation did not participate in the vote.

The UN General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution introduced by the United States calling for "Respect for the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others and its contribution to the economic and social development of member states." (Resolution 43/123.) The resolution urged member states and specialized agencies to take note of the report of the Secretary General containing comments by states on the relationship between respect for property and economic and social development. The German Democratic Republic also put forward a resolution on the impact of property on the enjoyment of human rights. (Resolution 43/124.) The General Assembly adopted the resolution by a vote of 129 to 24 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. Henceforth, resolutions on this topic will be considered biennially by the General Assembly.

National Institutions

The Commission adopted without a vote a resolution on national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights. The resolution encouraged member states to establish such institutions to serve as focal points for the dissemination of human rights materials. (Resolution 1988/72.) This issue is considered biennially by the UN General Assembly and was not under consideration at the 43rd session.

Free Elections

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, the United States put forward a high visibility initiative on enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections. (Resolution 43/157.) The draft was cosponsored by 17 member states and was adopted by consensus. This is a major step toward the U.S. goal of introducing resolutions in UN fora representing democratic values. The resolution stressed the following:

> . . . its conviction that periodic and genuine elections are a necessary and indispensable element of sustained efforts to protect the rights and interests of the governed, and that, as a matter of practical experience, the right of everyone to take part in the government of his or her country is a crucial factor in the effective enjoyment by all of a wide range of other human rights and fundamental freedoms, including political, economic, social and cultural rights.

The resolution requested the Commission to consider appropriate ways and means of enhancing the principle of periodic and genuine elections.

Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention or Imprisonment

The Human Rights Commission annually examines as a continuing area of human rights concern the question of the human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment. Connected with this agenda item are the sub-issues of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the question of enforced or involuntary disappearances, the question of human rights in the administration of justice and the right to freedom of expression and opinion.

The subject of torture was addressed in three resolutions approved under this agenda item. A resolution sponsored by Norway and other, mainly Western delegations dealt with the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/36.) A resolution with the same title, sponsored by Argentina, was also adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/31.)

On April 18 Deputy Secretary of State John C. Whitehead signed the Convention on behalf of the Administration. On May 23 President Reagan transmitted the Convention and a report from the Secretary of State including a number of reservations, understandings and declarations to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification.

The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution, again put forward by Norway and, which the United States joined as cosponsor, encouraging support for the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture. (Resolution 1988/35.)

Finally, a resolution was put forward by Belgium commending the Special Rapporteur for his report and extending his mandate for 2 years. This resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/32.) Ambassador

best copy available

Valladares made a moving statement condemning torture wherever it occurred, drawing on his own experiences as a political prisoner for 22 years in Cuba.

Concerning the subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances, France once again took the lead in proposing a resolution by which the Commission decided to extend for 2 years the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/34.) France also introduced a resolution on hostage taking that the United States joined as cosponsor. The resolution condemned those who take hostages, whatever their motives. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/38.) A resolution on political prisoners was introduced by the United Kingdom and was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/39.)

The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution on human rights in the administration of justice. (Resolution 1988/33.) The resolution called for member states to provide legislation and other mechanisms to ensure effective implementation of international standards relating to human rights in the administration of justice, in particular to the unacknowledged detention of persons. The Commission adopted without a vote a companion resolution, introduced by Belgium, on the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, jurors and assessors, and the independence of lawyers. (Resolution 1988/40.) The Commission adopted without a vote a resolution on the right to freedom of expression and opinion. (Resolution 1988/37.) Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution introduced by Portugal requesting the Secretary General to continue his efforts to secure the release of UN personnel held in detention and to ensure that the privileges and immunities of international civil servants are fully respected. (Resolution 1988/41.)

At the first regular session of ECOSOC, the mandate of a Special Rapporteur to examine questions relevant to torture was extended by consensus for 2 years. (Decision 1988/130.) ECOSOC also passed without a vote a decision to extend for 2 years the mandate of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances. (Decision 1988/107.)

At the General Assembly, resolutions 43/132 and 43/133, both adopted without votes, dealt with the subjects of the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture respectively, in terms similar to those already contained in the two resolutions adopted earlier in the year on the same subjects by the UN Human Rights Commission.

The subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances was again addressed by a resolution proposed by France and cosponsored by the United States and other Western members. The resolution welcomed the UNHRC decision to extend the mandate of the Working Group for 2 years and urged member states to extend their full cooperation to it. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/159.) Human Rights in the administration of justice was also addressed by the General Assembly. The resolution which was adopted without a vote, called on the Secretary General to assist member states in implementing international standards in this area through the program of advisory services. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/153.)

Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments

Human rights standard-setting through the drafting of conventions or declarations proceeded in four areas during 1988.

RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

A working group of the Commission on Human Rights met for 1 week prior to the opening of the 44th session of the Commission to carry on its work of elaborating a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child. The work has been underway since 1979. At its 1988 session, the working group completed the first reading of the draft Convention. Having received the report of its working group, the Commission adopted without a vote resolution 1988/75. Under this resolution the Commission decided to continue at its 45th session, as a matter of highest priority, its work on the elaboration of a draft Convention. A 2-week session of the working group was held in November-December 1988 with a view to completing the second reading of the draft Convention prior to the 45th UNHRC session. Finally, the Commission adopted, without a vote, a resolution on the prevention of the disappearance of children. (Resolution 1988/76.) The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted a resolution noting Commission resolution 1988/75 and authorizing a 2-week meeting of the Open Ended Working Group to take place in November-December 1988, prior to the 45th session of the Commission. (Resolution 1988/40.)

At the 43rd General Assembly, another procedural resolution on the question of a Convention on the Rights of the Child was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/112.) The resolution generally encouraged the Commission to proceed with its work on the draft Convention and to make every effort at its 45th session to complete the draft Convention to coincide with the 30th anniversary of the Declaration on the Rights of the Child and the 10th anniversary of the International Year of the Child.

HUMAN RIGHTS OF MIGRANT WORKERS

A working group on the drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families was established by the UN General Assembly in 1979. The working group held sessions from May 31–June 10 and again from September 26–October 7, during which it continued its second reading of a heavily bracketed text, adopting a number of provisions. Both the Commission and the General Assembly have been following the work of the Working Group with special interest. At the 44th UNHRC, a resolution proposed by Mexico, adopted without a vote, welcomed the progress which the Working Group had been making (Resolution 1988/77). Although the United States joined consensus, the U.S. Delegate made a statement outlining the U.S. reservations about the draft convention; namely that the International Labor Organization is the proper forum for such an endeavor and that there already existed two multilateral treaties on the rights of migrant workers (ILO Conventions Nos. 95 and 143).

By a vote of 154 to 1 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions, the 43rd General Assembly adopted resolution 43/146 which expressed satisfaction at the progress reported by the working group and provided for two further sessions of the working group in 1989 to continue the second reading of the draft Convention. The United States cast the sole vote against the resolution because it questions the need for this Convention, believes that to the extent a convention is needed it should be negotiated in the International Labor Organization, and objects to the expenditure by the United Nations of funds to support two meetings in 1989 for such a marginal project.

RIGHTS OF MINORITIES

Work on a draft Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National, Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities proceeded during the 44th UNHRC session. Progress on the drafting of a declaration has been marking time until the key definition of the term minority has been supplied to the Commission by its Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. In resolution 1988/64, adopted without a vote, the Commission decided to establish at its 45th session an open-ended working group to continue consideration of the revised Declaration that has been proposed by Yugoslavia.

HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS

The Commission at its 44th session adopted without a vote a resolution sponsored by Western countries including the United States, noting the progress of the open-ended working group to draft a Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and it called for the working group to reconvene prior to the 45th session of the Commission. (Resolution 1988/71.)

At its first regular session of 1988, ECOSOC approved a resolution authorizing the open-ended working group to meet for a period of 1 week prior to the 45th session of the Commission to continue drafting the text of the declaration. (Resolution 1988/39.)

Youth and Human Rights

Following upon a decision taken by the Commission on Human Rights at its 39th (1983) session, the Commission at its 41st session began the pattern of biennial consideration of an item entitled, "The Role of Youth in the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Including the Question of Conscientious Objection to Military Service." Thus, the issue did not arise at the 44th session.

The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted without a vote a decision taking note of the report of the Secretary General on coordination and information in the field of youth. (Decision 1988/147.)

At the General Assembly, youth and human rights remains a topic considered annually. The Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution on the International Youth Year (Resolution 43/94), and on the implementation of the Declaration Among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding Between Peoples (Resolution 43/136). For discussion of these resolutions see the subsection on Youth under the section on Social Development.

Review of the Work of the Subcommission on Minorities

One of the recurring items on the Commission's annual agenda is the report of the most recent session of the Commission's Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. The debate under this item consisted of a wide ranging review of the Subcommission's work, its mandate, and its methods of operation. The United States, in a detailed analysis delivered by Ambassador Alberto Piedra, and supported by many other delegations, criticized, for example, the nature of the Subcommission's continuously growing production of resolutions, many of which were of highly political content and which found no useful place on the work program of the Commission. The expert nature of the work to be done by the Subcommission was stressed. There was also almost unanimous concern that the study program of the Subcommission was out of control, with too many studies on diffuse topics being launched, resulting in the incapacity of the Human Rights Center to supply adequate support services. The debate was climaxed by a resolution proposed by the Federal Republic of Germany and other cosponsors which, in several operative paragraphs, sought to draw together the principal points of the discussion and draw these points to the attention of the Subcommission. The resolution in other provisions emphasized the expert nature of the work which the Subcommission was to perform and proposed measures to bring the Subcommission's study program into better balance with the Commission's needs. The resolution, which constituted a major step toward strengthening the oversight role of the Commission over the Subcommission, was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/43.)

The debate on the Subcommission's report also covered several resolutions which the Subcommission had forwarded to the Commission for action, five of which dealt with indigenous populations. The Commission approved without a vote a resolution which expressed general support for the work being carried out by the Subcommission's working group on Indigenous Populations and urged the working group to proceed in developing international standards based on a continued and comprehensive review of developments pertaining to the promotion and protection of the human rights of indigenous populations. (Resolution 1988/44.)

Resolution 1988/48, adopted without a vote, recommended that ECOSOC request the Secretary General to include promotion of the rights of indigenous populations in UN programs under the Second Decade Against Racism and Racial Discrimination. The resolution also recommended that ECOSOC request the Secretary General to organize a seminar on the rights of indigenous populations under the auspices of the advisory services program. The Commission adopted without a vote a resolution recommending that ECOSOC request the Subcommission's Working Group on Indigenous Populations to prepare a working paper containing a set of principles for a draft declaration on the rights of indigenous populations. (Resolution 1988/49.)

In addition, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution recommending that ECOSOC appoint a special rapporteur to prepare an outline for a proposed study on whether treaties between indigenous populations and governments protect the former's human rights. Ambassador Alberto Piedra questioned the utility of the study as formulated because only three countries, the United States, Canada and New Zealand, have concluded treaties with their indigenous populations. He noted that an examination of the human rights situations of indigenous populations who had not been afforded the protection of treaties would be more useful.

Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote resolution 1988/58 which recommended that ECOSOC request the Secretary General to declare an international year of the world's indigenous populations.

The Commission also endorsed resolution 1988/42 proposed by the Subcommission on the subject of slavery and slavery-like practices. The resolution, adopted without a vote, contained general provisions which highlighted the existence in the world today of certain slavery-like practices and contained recommendations to governments designed to cope with these situations. The resolution recommended to ECOSOC to endorse the recommendation of the Subcommission to appoint a special rapporteur on this issue.

The Commission approved without a vote a resolution proposed by Belgium which noted the report prepared by the expert of the Subcommission on the right of everyone to leave any country, including his own and to return to his country. The resolution expressed the Commission's interest in the Subcommission's drafting a declaration on this subject. (Resolution 1988/46.) The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution on the question of administrative detention without charge or trial. (Resolution 1988/45.) Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution requesting the Subcommission to consider measures to eliminate traditional practices affecting the health of women and children. (Resolution 1988/57.)

The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted without a vote a resolution commending the Subcommission's Working Group on Slavery for its examination of contemporary forms of slavery and endorsing the Commission's recommendation that the Subcommission consider appointing a special rapporteur on this issue. (Resolution 1988/34.) ECOSOC also considered four resolutions on indigenous populations. Resolution 1988/35 concerning the study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations was adopted without a vote. ECOSOC also adopted without a vote a resolution on a draft declaration of principles on the rights of indigenous populations. (Resolution 1988/36.) In addition, ECOSOC adopted without a vote a resolution on the proposal to proclaim an international year of the world's indigenous populations. (Resolution 1988/37.) Finally, ECOSOC adopted without vote decision 1988/134 authorizing the appointment of a special rapporteur to prepare an outline of a study on whether treaties concluded between indigenous populations and governments protect the former's human rights.

Violations of Human Rights

The recurring item on the Commission's annual agenda which relates to violations of human rights in any part of the world again occupied a major part of the Commission's time at its 44th session. A sub-item concerns human rights situations in particular countries brought to the Commission's attention under the confidential procedures established by ECOSOC resolution 1503 (XLVIII). The Commission took up in private sessions the human rights situations in nine cases (Albania, Benin, Brunei, Grenada, Honduras, Iraq, Pakistan, Paraguay and Zaire). The Commission decided by a vote of 15 (U.S.) to 11 with 17 abstentions to discontinue the confidential proceedings on the human rights situation in Albania and take it up under public procedure. This almost unprecedented action was a result of the Government of Albania's total lack of cooperation with the United Nations. (Resolution 1988/17.) The Commission decided to drop consideration of Benin, Grenada, Iraq and Pakistan.

The public debate under the violations agenda item was, as usual, marked by general statements by a large number of the Commission members surveying the state of human rights throughout the world. Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs Richard S. Williamson explained the concerns of the U.S. Government over negative human rights developments in Cuba, Ethiopia, Haiti, Nicaragua, North Korea, Paraguay, Romania, South Africa, the Soviet Union, Syria, Suriname and Vietnam. He stated, "Whether from the right or from the left, violations of basic human rights call out for the same condemnation by this body and by the world at large." In public session, the Commission adopted several resolutions dealing with separate country situations. Concerning the human rights situation in El Salvador, the Commission received another report from its Special Representative, Jose Antonio Pastor Ridruejo, and acted upon a draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Greece, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Costa Rica, France, Peru, Spain, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/65.) The resolution extended the mandate of the special representative for another year and more closely reflected the actual situation in that country than resolutions on El Salvador adopted in previous years.

The Special Rapporteur on human rights in Afghanistan, Mr. Felix Ermacora, presented another report to the Commission which differed from earlier reports because, for the first time, the Afghan authorities had allowed him to visit Afghanistan. The draft resolution, proposed by Belgium and other, mainly Western, cosponsors, reviewed the details of widespread grave and massive human rights violations being committed by Soviet troops and the Afghan authorities in Afghanistan and urged "the authorities in Afghanistan" to put a stop to them. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was extended for another year. The resolution was approved by a vote of 29 (U.S.) to 7, with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/67.)

Concerning human rights in Iran, the Commission heard the report of the Special Rapporteur, Mr. R. Galindo Pohl. The Commission also considered a draft resolution cosponsored by several Western countries. It expressed deep concern at the number and gravity of violations of human rights in Iran, including the situation of minority groups such as the Baha'is as indicated in the Special Rapporteur's report, and extended the Rapporteur's mandate for another year. The Pakistan Delegation moved to take no action on the resolution. The motion was decisively defeated in a vote of 10 to 18 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. The substantive resolution on the human rights situation in Iran was adopted by a vote of 20 (U.S.) to 5, with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/69.)

A resolution on the situation in southern Lebanon was proposed by India with a number of Arab and Soviet cosponsors. The draft resolution expressed grave concern over Israeli action in southern Lebanon, strongly condemned human rights violations by Israel, called on Israel to put an immediate end to repressive practices and to release detained and abducted persons. The resolution did not, however, refer to the presence of other foreign troops in Lebanon nor to the responsibility of the various Lebanese factions and militias for the country's turmoil. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 26 to 1 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/66.)

Finally, the Commission decided without a vote to postpone until the 45th (1989) UNHRC discussion of the situation of human rights in Cyprus. (Decision 1988/105.)

In addition to the foregoing country-specific resolutions, the Commission adopted three resolutions dealing with human rights problems in general. The Commission approved without a vote a resolution proposed by Norway and other Western cosponsors concerning the continuing problem of summary or arbitrary executions in various parts of the world. The resolution's text was based upon a report submitted to the Commission by its Special Rapporteur, Mr. S. Amos Wako. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was continued for another 2 years. (Resolution 1988/68.)

A resolution proposed by Ireland and other Western cosponsors, also approved without a vote, concerned the subject of human rights and mass exoduses. This resolution was another in a series of resolutions which have expressed the Commission's continuing concern over this problem. (Resolution 1988/70). Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution sponsored by Australia and other Western cosponsors on the question of a draft declaration on the right and responsibility of individuals, groups and organs of society to promote and protect universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms. This draft declaration, known as the Human Rights Defenders Declaration, is a Western initiative to protect and promote the activities of human rights monitoring groups worldwide and to facilitate the publication of information pertaining to human rights issues generally. The resolution noted the progress of the open-ended working group and decided to consider the issue under a separate agenda item at the 45th (1989) UNHRC.

At the first regular session of ECOSOC, the Commission's resolution on summary or arbitrary executions, the text of which had been phrased in terms calling for ECOSOC approval, was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1988/38.)

Also adopted by consensus was resolution 1988/39 authorizing an open-ended working group to meet for 1 week prior to the 45th session of the Commission to continue working on a draft declaration on the right and responsibility of individuals, groups and organs of society to promote and protect universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms (Human Rights Defenders Declaration).

Also approved were extensions of the mandates of individuals dealing with four country situations as follows: the Special Representative on human rights in El Salvador, without a vote (Decision 1988/135); the Special Rapporteur on human rights in Afghanistan, without a vote (Decision 1988/136); and the Special Representative on human rights in Iran, by a vote of 24 (U.S.) to 8, with 15 abstentions (Decision 1988/137). A resolution to move consideration of

Albania from the confidential proceedings under ECOSOC resolution 1503 to public consideration was defeated by a vote of 11 (U.S.) to 13 with 29 abstentions (Draft Decision II).

The 43rd General Assembly considered the usual concentration of country situations in Latin America (Chile and El Salvador), as well as Afghanistan and Iran.

A draft resolution on human rights in Afghanistan, proposed mainly by Western European cosponsors, which repeated the Commission's concern over the widespread violations of human rights in Afghanistan as revealed by the Special Rapporteur, was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/139.) Ambassador Patricia Byrne noted that a "basic improvement in the human rights environment depends on total withdrawal of Soviet forces and the restoration of an independent, broad-based and freely chosen Afghan government."

A draft resolution on human rights in El Salvador was approved without a vote. (Resolution 43/145.) The General Assembly also adopted a draft resolution on human rights in Iran by a vote of 61 (U.S.) to 25, with 44 abstentions. (Resolution 43/151.) A Pakistani motion to take no action on the resolution was decisively defeated with a vote of 40 to 50 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. The Iranian Delegation attempted to persuade the Western sponsors of the resolution to substitute a short, noncondemnatory resolution for the traditional resolution on Iran that details the violations of human rights occurring in that country, in exchange for vague promises to allow the special representative to enter Iran for the first time and to extend "full cooperation" to him. Ultimately, the Iranian Delegation was unable to provide any guarantees of these assurances and the negotiations broke off. These resolutions largely echoed the provisions of resolutions adopted earlier in the year by the Commission on Human Rights and ECOSOC and expressed support for the efforts of the Commission's Special Rapporteurs to assist the Commission in coping with human rights problems throughout the world.

A draft resolution on human rights and mass exoduses was proposed in terms similar to those contained in the resolution of the Commission on Human Rights adopted earlier in the year and called for continued attention to the problem of mass exoduses of refugees and displaced persons, including its root causes. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/154.) The General Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution on summary or arbitrary executions. (Resolution 43/151.) Finally, the General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution entitled "International cooperation in solving international problems of a social, cultural or humanitarian character." (Resolution 43/155.)

Human Rights in Chile

Unlike other country situations that were considered by the Commission on Human Rights at its 44th session under the item relating to human rights violations in any part of the world, the question of human rights in Chile was again considered under a separate agenda item. In accordance with the practice of many previous sessions, Mexico joined with other cosponsors in presenting a draft resolution. The resolution was tabled before the report of the Special Rapporteur on Chile, Fernando Volio Jimenez, was published and, hence did not accurately reflect the content and tone of the report, especially in reference to positive steps taken by the Chilean Government. Despite this irregularity, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 34 to 0 with 7 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1988/78.)

At the first regular session of ECOSOC, the Commission's decision to extend the mandate of its Special Rapporteur on Chile for 1 year was approved without a vote. (Decision 1988/140.)

At the 43rd UN General Assembly, a draft resolution on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile was again proposed by Mexico, in company with other cosponsors. The General Assembly had before it a preliminary report from the Special Rapporteur. The resolution was approved by a vote of 97 to 1, with 55 (U.S.) abstentions (Resolution 43/158). While the United States abstained, it did note that the resolution made substantial progress in presenting a more balanced picture of the human rights situation in Chile.

Advisory Services

Under the Human Rights Advisory Services Program, which is based upon General Assembly resolution 926 (X) adopted in 1955, the Secretary General reports annually to the Commission on Human Rights. His report covers three aspects of the program: advisory services of experts, fellowships and scholarships, and seminars. At the 44th session of the Commission on Human Rights, five resolutions were adopted under the Advisory Services item. A general resolution, proposed by the Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of a number of cosponsors, was designed to record the Commission's continuing interest in this program; the resolution's operative paragraphs encouraged the Secretary General to promote activities under the program. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/54.) The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution on the Voluntary Fund for Advisory Services and Technical Assistance in the Field of Human Rights. (Resolution 1988/53.) In resolution 1988/50, adopted without a vote, the Commission endorsed the conclusion of the report submitted by the expert on the services he provided to Guatemala and extended his mandate for 1 year. The Commission also adopted without a vote resolution 1988/51, noting the report of the expert providing services to Haiti and extending his mandate for one year. Finally, in resolution 1988/52, adopted without a vote, the Commission took note of a report submitted by an expert provided under the advisory services program to the Government of Equatorial Guinea. The Government of Equatorial Guinea was requested to take steps to assist in achieving the goals of the Advisory Services Program.

The first regular session of ECOSOC adopted decisions extending for 1 year the mandates of the experts for Guatemala (Decision 1988/130), Haiti (Decision 1988/132) and Equatorial Guinea (Decision 1988/133).

Measures Against Totalitarian and Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination

At its 44th (1988) session, the Commission briefly considered the agenda item that appears on the agenda biennially, which has traditionally been of special interest to Communist countries entitled, "Measures to be taken against all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, including Nazi, fascist and neofascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights, or fundamental freedoms or which have such consequences." An omnibus resolution submitted by Communist countries containing many provisions declaiming against the alleged resurgence of Nazi and fascist ideologies since the Second World War and calling for measures to combat these evils was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/63.) The United States broadened the scope of the resolution to condemn all other forms of totalitarian ideologies. The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution calling for the apprehension, trial and punishment of Nazi war criminals. (Resolution 1988/47.) At the 43rd General Assembly, a resolution on totalitarian ideologies was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/150.)

Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights

A recurring item on the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights concerns the status of the International Covenants on Human Rights, which is the subject of an annual report to the Commission submitted by the Secretary General. At its 44th session the Commission approved without a vote a draft resolution presented by Norway and other cosponsors which constituted a general appeal for more states to become parties to the Covenants and stressed the need for smoother functioning implementation mechanisms under the Covenants. (Resolution 1988/27.) On the initiative of the Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Commission adopted without a vote a decision concerning the elaboration of a Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. (Decision 1988/104.)

The Commission also approved without a vote a Byelorussian draft resolution on the crime of genocide which urged all states which have not yet done so to ratify the Genocide Convention. (Resolution 1988/28.) On November 25 the United States deposited its instrument of ratification with the United Nations, thereby becoming a party to the Convention.

The first regular session of ECOSOC also adopted two resolutions calling for states to ratify the International Covenants. (Resolutions 1988/4; 1988/5.)

The 43rd UN General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution which again urged governments to become parties to the Covenants and to support actively their implementation mechanisms. (Resolution 43/114.) The 43rd General Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution dealing with reporting obligations of states parties to UN conventions on human rights. The resolution was based on a report submitted by the Secretary General which addressed the growing problem of the failure of states parties to various UN conventions to comply in a timely manner with their reporting obligations under these conventions. In its operative paragraphs, the resolution drew attention to this problem and exhorted governments to improve compliance with their reporting obligations. A number of measures to assist states in carrying out their reporting obligations were also put forward in the resolution. (Resolution 43/115.) In addition, the General Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution on the status of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide urging states that had not already done so to ratify the Convention. (Resolution 43/138.)

Regional Arrangements

Carrying forth its interest in promoting the establishment of regional institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights in the Asian-Pacific Region, the Commission at its 44th session adopted without a vote a draft resolution proposed by the Delegation of Sri Lanka and cosponsored by China and the Philippines. The resolution invited further comments from governments which had not yet commented on the report of the seminar on regional arrangements in the Asian region, held in Colombo in 1982. In addition, the Secretary General was requested, in cooperation with the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, and governments of the region, to consider the establishment of a training course on teaching human rights materials. The Secretary General was requested to report on the matter to the 45th Commission session. (Resolution 1988/73.)

The 43rd UN General Assembly, which considers the issue of regional arrangements biennially, adopted two, essentially procedural, resolutions in this area. One resolution requested the Secretary General to consider the possibility of encouraging contacts between representatives of regional organizations and the UN human rights bodies. It also requested the Commission to pay special attention to the most appropriate ways of assisting countries of different regions under the Program of Advisory Services. The Secretary General was invited to submit to the 45th General Assembly a report on the state of regional human rights arrangements. (Resolution 43/151.)

Another resolution, also adopted without a vote focused on the Asian region. The resolution invited states members of the Economic and Social

Commission for Asia and the Pacific that had not yet done so to communicate their comments on the report of the Seminar on National, Local and Regional Arrangements for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Asian Region, which was held in Colombo in 1982. It was stated in the resolution that further comments were desired in order to enable further consultations. The Secretary General was requested to report to the 45th General Assembly on the responses received. (Resolution 43/140.)

Science and Technology

The issue of science and technology in the area of human rights is considered biennially by the United Nations. The Human Rights Commission considered four resolutions in this area at its 44th session. The first, introduced by Japan and cosponsored by Yugoslavia, on the subject of the use of scientific and technological developments for the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1988/59.) A second resolution, introduced by the U.S.S.R. on the issue of human rights and scientific and technological developments, concerned the relationship between human rights and disarmament, also known as the "right to life." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 30 to 9 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 1988/60.) This "right" has been linked to the achievement of general and complete disarmament and a halt to the arms race. The U.S. and other Delegations have opposed such initiatives on the ground that the disarmament issues highlighted are not proper subjects for the human rights debate but should be discussed in the appropriate disarmament fora. Western delegations also consider that any resolutions that are devoted to the protection of the basic "right to life" should recognize that an essential component of this right is "liberty and security of person." A third resolution, introduced by Byelorussia and cosponsored by Bulgaria and Poland, also concerned human rights and scientific and technological developments, called upon the Subcommission to undertake a study on technology and the right to work and development. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 30 to 0, with 13 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1988/61.) Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution introduced by the United Kingdom and cosponsored by the United States and others urging completion of the Subcommission's study on a draft Body of Guidelines, Principles and Guarantees of the rights of persons detained on grounds of mental ill-health or suffering from mental disorder.

The first regular session of ECOSOC which considers biennially the issue of the use of science and technology in the interest of social and economic development, did not consider a resolution on the topic in 1988. The 43rd General Assembly did consider three resolutions. The first, proposed by the United Kingdom and other cosponsors, focused upon the problem of the abuse of psychiatric institutions as a means of controlling human rights dissent. In the draft resolution, the Assembly reaffirmed its conviction that detention of persons in mental institutions on account of their political views or on other nonmedical grounds is a violation of human rights. The resolution urged the Commission on Human Rights to consider the draft Body of Guidelines, Principles and Guarantees adopted by the Subcommission relating to this problem. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/109.)

Another resolution proposed by the Representative of the U.S.S.R. on behalf of a collection of mainly Communist cosponsors carried forward a favorite Soviet theme to use the subject of scientific and technological development as a vehicle for turning a human rights debate into one on disarmament. The resolution proposed by the U.S.S.R. reaffirmed the importance of the inherent right to life and stressed the urgent need for a halt to the arms race and general and complete disarmament. The draft resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/111.)

Finally a draft resolution proposed by the Byelorussian S.S.R. and cosponsored by mainly Communist delegations centered upon the importance of the implementation of a Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interest of Peace and For the Benefit of Mankind. The Declaration had been adopted by the General Assembly in 1975. The United States has always regarded this Declaration as being unbalanced because it unduly emphasizes the relationship between science and technology and the so-called economic human rights, and seems to downplay the importance of the relationship with basic civil and political rights. The resolution was approved by a vote of 131 to 0 with 24 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 43/110.)

New International Humanitarian Order

An item entitled, "New International Humanitarian Order," an initiative of Jordan, has been considered by the General Assembly since 1981. The proponents of the resolution.believe that the item is the means for elaborating an internationally recognized framework of comprehensive humanitarian principles governing relations among peoples and nations in times of war and peace. A draft resolution proposed by Jordan and other cosponsors took note of the activities of the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues as summarized in the Secretary General's report and invited governments that had not yet done so to communicate to the Secretary General their views regarding the proposal. A further report was requested from the Secretary General which will be considered by the General Assembly at its 45th session. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 43/129.)

The 43rd General Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution on the promotion of international cooperation in the humanitarian field. (Resolution 43/130.) Finally, the 43rd Assembly adopted without a vote a resolution cosponsored by the United States on humanitarian assistance to victims of natural disasters and similar emergency situations. (Resolution 43/131.)

Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities

The 40th session of the Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities met in Geneva August 8–September 2. The 26-member Subcommission is composed of experts who act in their individual capacity, and who in theory do not involve the responsibility of the governments of the states of which they are nationals. The Subcommission reports to its parent body, the Commission on Human Rights.

At its 40th session, the Subcommission dealt with an agenda which in recent years has become increasingly crowded and adopted 40 resolutions and 13 decisions. One feature of the Subcommission's work program which has been of increasing concern to the Commission in recent years has been the Subcommission's growing pattern of reports and studies which are under preparation by various individual Subcommission members. Its 40th sessional report showed that 17 such studies and reports are at various stages of preparation. Among these, two bear a special relationship to interests being pursued by the United States in the Commission. The Subcommission received a progress report from its special rapporteur who is preparing an analysis of the current trends and developments regarding administrative detention without charge or trial. A special rapporteur is preparing a working paper on the right to freedom of expression and opinion. The Subcommission completed a draft Body of Principles, Guidelines for the protection of mentally-ill persons and for the improvement of mental health care.

Two presessional working groups of the Subcommission, one on slavery and slavery-like practices and the other on indigenous populations, provided reports which were the basis for follow-up actions by the Subcommission in calling the attention of the Commission to the need to combat various slavery-like practices which exist in the world today and in carrying forward a plan of action for the development of international standards in the field of discrimination against indigenous populations. The Subcommission endorsed the outline prepared by the Special Rapporteur on a proposed study on whether treaties concluded between indigenous populations and governments protect the former's human rights.

Along with the Subcommission's activities in developing expert recommendations and standards with respect to the various subjects under study, the Subcommission also devoted much of its time to a discussion of a number of resolutions which emphasize the more political and less expert side of the Subcommission's work. The Subcommission adopted resolutions relating to the situation in the territories occupied by Israel, the situation of human rights in Albania, Burundi, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Lebanon, Namibia, Pakistan and South Africa. The Subcommission also passed resolutions on AIDS and toxic wastes. The Subcommission passed a resolution calling for the protection of UN staff members who have been detained by member states.

In closed sessions, the Subcommission dealt with recommendations of its presessional Working Group on Communications. This standing working group was established under ECOSOC resolution 1503 (XLVIII) to screen the thousands of human rights communications received each year by the United Nations from private sources. The working group's task is to identify for the full Subcommission situations appearing to reveal a consistent pattern of gross and reliably attested violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Subcommission decided to refer nine situations to the Commission for consideration.

Status of Women

Women's issues were discussed at a series of UN meetings during 1988. The focus of these discussions was the ability of the United Nations to implement the consensus final document of the Nairobi World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the UN Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, held at Nairobi, Kenya, in late 1985.

That document, known as the Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, represented a constructive departure from the divisive and politicized outcomes of previous conferences held under the aegis of the Decade, and set the stage for a major effort to enhance the effectiveness of UN machinery and programs for the advancement of women. At each of the 1988 meetings, important steps were taken to translate the guidelines of the Forward-Looking Strategies into concrete initiatives. In this process, the U.S. Representative to the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), Maureen Reagan, continued to play a key role.

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Preceding the 32nd session of the Commission on the Status of Women, the Government of France hosted a conference on the status of women. From March 8–11, 1988, representatives of 29 member states of the CSW, observers from other member states of the United Nations and one nonmember state met in Paris for a conference entitled "Women: Equality in Participation." Representatives of specialized institutions, intergovernmental, nongovernmental and other organizations also attended. Following this conference, the French Delegation submitted a summary report to the CSW.

The 32nd session of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) was held in Vienna, from March 14 –23.

The meeting was attended by 31 of the 32 member states of the Commission, by observers from 44 other countries, and by representatives of UN specialized agencies, UN bodies and intergovernmental organizations, national liberation movements and nongovernmental organizations.

The Commission elected Lindsay Niemann (Canada) as chairperson; Thereza Maria Machado Quintella (Brazil), Wang Shuxian (China), and Dagmar Molkova (Czechoslovakia) as vice-chairpersons; and Liliane Dubois (Mauritius) as rapporteur.

This session was the first that was conducted under the reformed agenda adopted at the CSW special session in New York, in January 1987. At that time, it was agreed that the next five sessions of the CSW would discuss a priority theme based upon each of the three Forward-Looking Strategies of the Nairobi World Conference. The 1988 themes were:

— Equality: national machinery for monitoring and improving the status of women;
— Development: problems of rural women, including food, water resources, agricultural technology, rural employment, transportation and environment; and
— Peace : access to information, education for peace and efforts to eradicate violence against women within the family and society.

The major agenda items were: programming and coordination matters related to the United Nations and the UN system; monitoring the implementation of the Forward Looking Strategies; and discussion of the priority themes.

The agenda item on programming and coordination matters received important attention in several of the Commission's meetings. The Commission adopted four resolutions designed to integrate the Forward Looking Strategies into the UN's medium-term and system-wide medium-term plans in the area of advancement of women. Two resolutions were adopted to improve the status of women employees of the UN system: One requested an extension of the mandate of the Office of the Coordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women in the Secretariat for the biennium 1988–1989; and the other requested each UN organization to designate a coordinator to improve the status of women in their organizations.

The CSW also adopted resolutions which recommended that individual governments and organizations of the UN system allocate special resources to ensure programs and projects for the advancement of women; and which requested the Secretary General to instigate a nondiscriminatory language policy which would provide guidance to the UN Staff and review the language in the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of ECOSOC.

Under the agenda item on monitoring the implementation of the Forward-Looking Strategies, the CSW decided that its 1990 session should be of extended duration in order to review and appraise progress on the implementation of the Forward Looking Strategies. In order to make the extended session more meaningful, the CSW also adopted a resolution to establish a comprehensive reporting system to monitor, review and appraise the implementation of the Forward Looking Strategies. Section one of the annex to this resolution provides an outline for biennial reports that are to be prepared by the United Nations; section two addresses the reports that are to be prepared by member states every 5 years (beginning in 1990) outlining the progress achieved in implementing the Forward Looking Strategies. Nongovernmental organizations were also invited to report.

The CSW further recommended that the survey on women in development be updated in light of the deterioration in the status of women in developing countries, and that it should emphasize those aspects which contribute to this situation, namely the economic crisis, including the problem of external debt servicing.

In another resolution, the CSW requested the Secretary General to promote the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and urged states that have not yet done so to ratify the convention.

The G-77 introduced a resolution on women and peace in Central America, which called upon Central American presidents to continue their joint efforts to achieve peace. It also urged women's organizations to participate in the peace process, and exhorted governments of Central American countries, of the Contadora Group, and of the Support Group to encourage and guarantee the full participation of women at all levels in the search for peace. After negotiating a change in the text, the United States joined consensus in adopting this resolution.

The CSW recommended expansion of the CSW to 43 members in accordance with the regional distribution of the UN Human Rights Commission. It further recommended that expansion take effect from the beginning of 1989. Although the United States preferred that the CSW not be enlarged, the United States joined consensus in adopting the resolution because it at least reflected the geographic distribution of the UN Human Rights Commission.

The agenda item on monitoring the implementation of the Forward-Looking Strategies also contained contentious resolutions, on which the United States called for roll-call votes:

The United States abstained on the resolution entitled, "Women and Children in Namibia," which rejected the linkage of the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola (25 to 0, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions); and voted "no" on the resolution on "Women and Children under Apartheid," which called for the imposition of sanctions against South

Africa (26 to 1 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions). Failure to reach consensus on "Women and Children under Apartheid" proved disappointing. The United States was willing to make significant concessions, but the Africans would not yield on the resolution's language calling for support to "liberation movements."

The United States also voted "no" on "the Situation of Palestinian Women," which called for the creation of a committee to travel to the occupied territories to investigate and report upon the status of Palestinian women under Israeli occupation (20 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions). The Secretariat was unable to provide a financial implications statement, as the mandate in the resolution was vague.

Five resolutions were introduced and adopted by consensus under the agenda item on the priority themes: equality, development and peace.

The United States had significant input into the drafting of a resolution concerning rural women and development. The United States was also one of many cosponsors of this resolution. While development did not receive as much attention as the United States had hoped, it was one of the highlights of the meeting as it dealt with something tangible.

The United States was able to keep a major portion of the peace theme focused on family violence directed against women. Resolutions regarding "Efforts to Eradicate Violence against Women within the Family and Society" and "Participation of Women in Promoting International Peace and Cooperation" both call for action to end family violence directed against women.

A resolution was adopted urging countries to establish national machinery. The United States joined consensus in adopting this resolution, although the United States believes that it is not necessary to have national machinery in place in order for progress to be made in advancing the status of women.

A resolution on the long-term program of work of the CSW made recommendations for the preparation of reports on the priority themes.

The CSW dealt with 33 resolutions or documents. The United States joined consensus in adopting all, except three of them. The United States introduced and cosponsored a resolution requesting the Secretary General to extend the mandate of the Office of the Coordinator for Women in the Secretariat for the biennium 1988–1989; and sponsored resolutions on: the 1990 CSW's extended session, the use of gender-neutral language and the state of rural women in developing countries. The United States worked closely with the G-77 to ensure that this resolution reflected U.S. goals in the development area.

FIRST REGULAR SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The Second (Social) Committee of the Economic and Social Council considered the question of advancement of women (agenda item 11), at its first regular session of 1988, from May 9–13 and 17–18.

The Committee had before it the report of the Secretary General on the reporting system for monitoring, review and appraisal of progress in the advancement of women (E/1988/4); the report of the CSW on its 32nd session (E/1988/15 and Add.1); the report of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) on its eighth session (E/1988/28), and related documents.

Of the 17 draft resolutions and two draft decisions recommended by the report of the Commission on the Status of Women, the Council adopted 13 by consensus and three by vote, and delayed consideration of two until the second regular session of ECOSOC, and one until the 1989 first regular session of ECOSOC.

The drafts adopted by consensus included improvement of the status of women in the secretariats of the UN system; extended session of the CSW in 1990 to review and appraise progress in the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies (FLS); women and peace in Central America; efforts to eradicate violence against women within family and society; participation of women in promoting international peace and cooperation; rural women and development; and national machinery for the advancement of women.

The Committee also adopted a consensus resolution on INSTRAW, which *inter alia*, commended the work of the Institute and renewed the appeal to governments, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations and other potential donors to contribute to the trust fund for the Institute.

The United States called for votes on resolutions dealing with apartheid, Namibia and Palestinian women. All three of these resolutions were adopted. The votes were as follows: "Women and Children Under Apartheid," 34 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.), with 8 abstentions; "Women and Children in Namibia," 38 to 0, with 9 abstentions (including the U.S.); "The Situation of Palestinian Women," 33 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.

The Committee delayed consideration, until ECOSOC's second regular session, of resolutions dealing with the system-wide, medium-term plan for the advancement of women: equality, development and peace; and system-wide coordination of activities to advance the status of women and to integrate women in development. The Committee delayed consideration of enlargement of the Commission on the Status of Women, until ECOSOC's 1989 first regular session.

Although the 32nd CSW had adopted a consensus resolution to enlarge the membership of the CSW from 32 to 43, and to allocate the seats in a manner identical to the UN Human Rights Commission, during the ECOSOC Second Committee meetings, the G–77 rejected the consensus agreement.

Tunisia, on behalf of the G–77, introduced amendments to the resolution, which changed the allocation of seats from "that of the Commission on Human Rights" to "the principle of equitable geographic distribution," and which delayed the effective date of enlargement from "the beginning of 1989" to "no later than the beginning of 1990."

On May 23 the second committee of ECOSOC adopted a Chairman's resolution that deferred enlargement of the CSW. This resolution accepted in principle the enlargement of the CSW but delayed action on the enlargement resolution and the proposed G–77 amendments until the first regular session of ECOSOC in 1989. It asked the 1989 CSW to consider the matter and to provide its views on the issue in light of the discussions held during the 1988 ECOSOC. It also urged that regional consultations take place before the 1989 CSW.

On May 26 the 54-member ECOSOC held elections for membership to the CSW. Two Asian seats were contested by four candidates. Japan and Thailand were elected over Iran and Iraq. The Latin Group produced a consensus slate for its two vacancies: Brazil and Colombia. Hungary was the only candidate for the one vacancy in the Eastern Group. The Africans produced a consensus slate of three candidates for three seats: Morocco, Sudan and Tanzania.

The Western Group had three vacancies and eight candidates: Austria, Canada, France, Greece, The Netherlands, Spain, Portugal and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands and Spain withdrew their candidacies prior to voting. Balloting was as follows: Austria (29), Canada (28), France (29), Greece (27), Portugal (19) and the United Kingdom (26). Austria, Canada and France were declared elected.

On May 27 ECOSOC plenary adopted the report of the ECOSOC second committee on Agenda Item 11 "The Advancement of Women" (UN documents E/1988/90 and E/1988/90 Add.1). Votes were called on three resolutions and one decision. The rest of the report was adopted by consensus. The United States called for a vote on three resolutions:

On "Women and Children under Apartheid" the vote was 44 to 2 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (In committee, the vote had been 34 to 2 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions.)

Concerning "The Situation of Palestinian Women" the result of the vote was 39 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. (In committee, the vote had been 33 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.)

The vote on "Women and Children in Namibia" was 44 to 0 with 9 (U.S.) abstentions. (In committee, the vote had been 38 to 0 with 9 (U.S.) abstentions.)

After failing to get an opinion from the UN Legal Office declaring invalid any CSW or ECOSOC recommendation to extend the mandate of the Coordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women in the Secretariat, Belgium called for a vote on the decision. The vote was 18 (U.S.) to 0, with 31 abstentions. Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and Somalia made explanations of their positions after the vote. The Europeans stressed the financial implications of extending the mandate at a time of UN financial crisis. Somalia, on behalf of the African group, said it could not support extending the mandate when UN efforts against apartheid were allegedly being curtailed for budgetary reasons. (Second Committee had adopted the decision without vote or comment.)

SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

At its first regular session, ECOSOC had deferred consideration of two draft resolutions until its second regular session— "System-Wide Medium-Term Plan for the Advancement of Women: Equality, Development and Peace" and "System-Wide Coordination of Activities to Advance the Status of Women and to Integrate Women in Development." At its eighth meeting, on July 15, the Committee for Program and Coordination (the Third Committee) adopted both resolutions. On July 27 the Council likewise adopted these resolutions.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

From October 27 through November 3, the Third (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) Committee of the General Assembly considered issues of special concern to women under agenda item 94 "Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women" and agenda item 95 "Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women."

The Committee had before it reports by the Secretary General on the UN Development Fund for Women; the implementation of the Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, the status of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; and related documents.

The U.S. Representative to the CSW, Maureen Reagan, made a statement, which addressed some of the priority themes of the 1989 CSW. On literacy and education she said:

> Granted, education and training are not free. But we cannot afford to be shortsighted in tallying the cost of these programs. The equation for determining the true costs must include not only the amount of money invested in these programs, but the economic and social return which accrues to a society as a result of a larger better prepared work force.

On the theme of "full participation of women in the construction of their countries and in the creation of just social and political systems," Ms. Reagan spoke:

> Not only must women participate in the election process by voting, but they should also participate as candidates. Encouraging women to run for office has been one of my main functions as Co-Chair of my political party's National Committee.

The Committee considered five resolutions, which were all adopted by consensus: Under item 94, resolution 43/100 "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women," urged *inter alia* states to ratify the convention. There were four resolutions under agenda item 95. Resolution 43/101 "Implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women" reinforced the importance of the priority themes. Resolution 43/102 "UN Development Fund for Women" commended the Fund and urged governments, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals to contribute to it. Resolution 43/103 "Improvement of the Status of Women in the Secretariat" urged the appointment of a senior-level woman to be the focal point to ensure improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat. Resolution 43/104 "Participation of women in Promoting Peace and Cooperation" appealed to governments to facilitate women's participation in the decision-making process, including that related to peace, disarmament negotiations and the resolution of conflicts. (After negotiations with the German Democratic Republic, the sponsors of the resolution on peace, the United States was able to join consensus.)

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) held its fourth regional conference on the integration of women into the economic and social development of Latin America and the Caribbean, September 27–30 in Guatemala City, Guatemala. The conference reviewed aspects of the status of women in the region and attempted to develop forward-looking strategies for advancing the role of women in the region.

Although the final document was adopted by consensus, U.S. reservations were noted on two paragraphs which concerned external debt agreements and adjustment programs. The United States considered these paragraphs to be inaccurate and extraneous to the issue of the incorporation of women into the economy.

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE IAEA

UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

INTRODUCTION

The UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) was created in 1967 as an autonomous organization within the UN Secretariat to accelerate and promote the process of industrialization in developing countries. On January 1, 1986, UNIDO was converted into an independent specialized agency of the UN system. Membership in UNIDO is open to all members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the IAEA. In 1988 UNIDO admitted as members Albania, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Maldives, bringing the total membership to 152 states. The United States has participated in UNIDO since its inception.

UNIDO, headquartered in Vienna, has three principal organs: the General Conference (GC), the Industrial Development Board (IDB) and the Program and Budget Committee (PBC). The Secretariat is the implementing organ of UNIDO. The IDB and PBC meet annually and the GC meets biennially. PBC recommendations are passed to the IDB for consideration and all IDB decisions go forward to the GC for consideration. The GC, IDB and PBC all require a two-thirds majority to adopt decisions with financial implications.

UNIDO MEETINGS

The United States sent delegations to the two major meetings held by UNIDO in 1988: the 27-member Program and Budget Committee (PBC)* held in Vienna, June 20–24, and the 53-member Industrial Development Board (IDB)** held in Vienna, October 10–18.

ACTIVITIES IN 1988

Program and Budget Committee

The Program and Budget Committee reached consensus agreement on all budget decisions, including a request to the Director General to prepare a zero-real-growth budget for the 1990–1991 biennium. This decision was a result of a U.S.-drafted 1987 General Conference decision which requested the Director General to establish a resource ceiling for the following biennium.

Faced with deficits in the operational budget caused primarily by unfavorable exchange rates, the PBC approved a decision calling on the Director General to prepare an in-depth study on the scope and content of the operational budget and its relationship to the regular budget. The results of the study will be reported to the next PBC.

---

*PBC Members: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Morocco, The Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States and Zimbabwe.

**IDB Members: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Poland, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Tanzania, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

All Program and Budget Committee decisions were recommended to the Industrial Development Board for consideration.

Resumed Industrial Development Board Session

A special Industrial Development Board session, held consecutively with the Program Budget Committee, approved the Director General's recommendation of Louis Faoro (U.S.) to be appointed as the Deputy Director General for Administration.

Industrial Development Board

The U.S. statement to the Industrial Development Board (IDB) plenary focused primarily on the substantive work program of the organization. We specifically mentioned UNIDO's success in drawing private sector capital and know-how to address industrialization needs and aspirations, particularly in the agro-industrial sector. The United States reaffirmed support for this new orientation of UNIDO, progress made in improving the System of Consultations Division, and its cooperation with other UN agencies, most noteworthy, the UN Development Program, the International Labor Organization and the UN Environment Program.

Other IDB member statements adhered closely to familiar topics, including calls for redeployment of global resources and accelerated assistance to Africa. The U.S., U.S.S.R. and numerous other delegations mentioned the importance of greater support for environmental activities. There was general praise of UNIDO's performance, particularly in light of its reduced resources.

— **Budget Reform.** The Industrial Development Board approved virtually unchanged the program and budget decisions recommended by the Program and Budget Committee, including the consensus decision for a zero-real-growth budget for the 1990–1991 biennium. The United States had worked long for this goal.

— **Management Review.** One of the most important decisions taken by the IDB, with strong U.S. support, requested the Director General to commission a management review of the organizational and staff structure of UNIDO. The UNIDO Secretariat undertook the review and the results will be discussed by the next Program and Budget Committee.

— ***Arrearages in U.S. Assessed Contributions.*** *At the end of 1988, the United States remained in serious arrears, owing approximately $20 million. However, Domingo Siazon, Director General of UNIDO, in opening remarks to the IDB, noted an encouraging shift in the U.S. mood as exemplified by President Reagan's determination to fund in full the United Nations in the U.S. fiscal year 1990.*

— **Investment Promotion Service Guidelines.** The United States introduced a draft decision proposing that member governments adopt guidelines for the UNIDO Investment Promotion Service offices. The guidelines would clarify the IPS mandate by limiting IPS activity to promoting outward flows of investment capital and expertise from developed to developing countries. The proposed guidelines also stipulate host country funding of the IPS offices. The guidelines were designed to curb a recent trend towards using the IPS offices to attract inward investment to IPS host countries.

Funding for IPS offices was a difficult issue for the United States in UNIDO deliberations, as the Washington IPS office had been partially subsidized by UNIDO. IDB members deferred decision on the guidelines until the next IDB in order to provide more time to study the issue.

— **Political Issues.** At the IDB, the United States called for a vote and voted no on a proposed decision that UNIDO implement technical assistance to Palestinian people in close cooperation with the Palestine Liberation Organization. The decision was approved by a large majority.

INVESTMENT PROMOTION SERVICE

The UNIDO-sponsored Washington Investment Promotion Service office (IPS) was established to attract joint venture partners and investment capital to developing countries. There are nine such offices* throughout the world. Its program of work emphasizes increased and direct cooperation with the U.S. private sector at the level of industry associations, state and regional development associations, chambers of commerce, and individual firms. The office works closely with the Department of Commerce, Office of Multilateral Affairs, among others, and with all of the various programs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and with other functional areas of the U.S. Government. In 1988 the United States contributed $150,000 to the IPS office through the Department of State.

The IPS incorporated the International Industrial Development Foundation in the United States with a mandate to raise private-sector, tax-exempt contributions to finance industrial development efforts relating to UNIDO's mandate. The IRS tax-exempt status was granted in December 1988 and a meeting of the Board of Directors was announced for the following month. The members of the Board include Andrew Young, Mayor of Atlanta, Dr. Edward Mortola, President and Chancellor of Pace University, Professor Paul McCracken, University of Michigan, and former Chairman of the President's Economic Policy Council, Judith Werner, Automotive Industry Executive, and Harold MacDonald, Vice President (Retired), Ford Motor Company.

**IPS Offices:* *Cologne, Milan, Paris, Seoul, Tokyo, Vienna, Warsaw, Washington and Zurich.*

The Washington IPS, in collaboration with the U.S. Philippine Business Committee and other interested organizations in the United States, was represented at the Investors' Forum in November in Manila. Additionally, there were 42 potential American investors participating at the Forum.

In 1988 the Washington IPS concluded various joint venture projects in developing countries, most notably rubber gloves manufacturing facilities in China and Thailand and an agriculture-livestock venture in Egypt.

World Bank Group

The World Bank Group is composed of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). As a member of the UN system and as a development finance institution, the World Bank works with the United Nations and its various specialized agencies in a wide variety of activities. During the Bank Group's FY 1988 (FY 88 ended June 30, 1988), St. Kitts and Nevis and Poland joined the IDA, bringing IDA membership to 137. IBRD membership remained unchanged at 151. IFC membership stood at 133 by the fiscal year's end.

The Bank stimulates economic growth in its member countries with loans either at near commercial terms (IBRD) or at highly concessional terms (IDA) for sound projects. The Bank traditionally financed all types of capital infrastructure, but in 1980 it inaugurated a program of adjustment lending to support specific policy changes and institutional reforms in developing countries. Adjustment lending accounted for 25 percent of total IBRD/IDA lending in FY 88.

Barber Conable became the seventh president of the World Bank effective July 1, 1986, replacing A.W. Clausen who had served as president for 5 years.

IDA AND IBRD LENDING PROGRAM

The IBRD approved $14.8 billion in loans for FY 88 to support 118 projects in 37 countries, a 4 percent increase over FY 87. IDA credits amounted to $4.5 billion, up 29 percent from the previous year, for 99 projects in 36 countries.

IDA credits are concentrated in the poorest countries with an annual per capita income of $920 or less. However, virtually all IDA lending is directed to countries with annual per capita income below $580. Under the terms of the most recent replenishment (IDA VIII), 45–50 percent of IDA lending is earmarked for the nations of sub-Saharan Africa.

As of June 30, the World Bank had approved $1.1 billion in credits involving 49 operations under the Special Facility for sub-Saharan Africa. These operations were in support of countries that had undertaken or were committed to undertake appropriate medium-term programs of policy reform.

In addition, the World Bank is managing the $6.4 billion Special Program of Assistance for Africa. A joint program between the Bank and bilateral donors is aimed at providing fast disbursing balance of payments support to low income, debt distressed African countries undertaking economic reform.

Total IBRD and IDA commitments in FY 88 had the following sectoral composition:

Sector	U.S. Dollars (Millions)	Dollar Percentage
Agriculture and Rural Development	4,493.9	23.4
Development Finance Companies	1,712.5	8.9
Education	864.0	4.5
Energy	—	—
Oil, Coal and Gas	388.1	2.0
Power	2,006.9	10.4
Industry	2,224.6	11.6
Nonproject	1,687.0	8.8
Population, Health and Nutrition	304.9	1.6
Small Scale Enterprise	513.0	2.7
Technical Assistance	95.7	0.5
Telecommunications	36.0	0.2
Transportation	2,642.5	13.7
Urban Development	1,716.3	8.9
Water Supply and Sewerage	535.3	2.8
TOTAL	19,220.7	100.0

Projects approved by the IBRD and IDA during FY 88 had the following regional distribution:

Region	Projects	U.S. Dollars (Millions)	Percentage
Sub-Saharan Africa	80	2,928.7	15.2
Asia	65	7,669.6	39.9
Europe, Middle East and N. Africa	35	3,358.4	17.5
Latin America and Caribbean	37	5,264.0	27.4
TOTAL	217	19,220.7	100.0

The Bank's Governors authorized a $74.8 billion general capital increase (GCI) for the IBRD on April 27, 1988. This increase will bring the Bank's total authorized capital to $171.4 billion and permit a substantial rise in its sustainable level of lending.

MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT GUARANTEE AGENCY

With U.S. support, the international convention establishing the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) entered into force on April 12, 1988. MIGA is expected to commence operations during 1989.

MIGA, which has as its goal increasing private investment flows to developing countries, is endowed with authority to issue guarantees against noncommercial risk and to provide a wide range of technical assistance and consultative activities.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

The IFC assists the economic development of its borrowing member countries by making loans to, and equity investments in, productive enterprises in the private sector; matching investment opportunities with domestic and foreign private capital and experienced management; helping to develop local and regional capital markets; and promoting privately owned development finance corporations. Projects are selected on the basis of financial viability and their contribution to economic development.

The IFC approved $1.3 billion for 95 projects in 40 countries during FY 88, a 38 percent increase in lending over the prior year. The number of companies in which IFC holds investments rose from 404 to 449 by end of FY 1988. These investments are broadly distributed among 77 countries. During FY 88, IFC activities in the capital markets area expanded with the creation of six country funds, including three funds to facilitate the conversion of debt into equity investments. The IFC also expanded its range of advisory services to governments and businesses in the developing word.

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

Use of IMF resources continued to decline in 1988 as the world economy achieved moderate growth in its sixth year of sustained recovery. Drawings on IMF loans totaled Special Drawing Rights (SDR)[*] 2.7 billion in 1988, a slight decline from SDR 3.3 billion in 1987. Drawings had peaked at SDR 13.2 billion in 1983, falling to SDR 7.3 billion in 1984, SDR 4.0 billion in 1985 and SDR 3.8 billion in 1986. New loan commitments increased to SDR 2.9

---

[*] The SDR is the unit of account used by the IMF. A composite of the U.S. dollar, French franc, German mark, British pound sterling and Japanese yen, the SDR was worth $1.35 on December 31, 1988. The average value of the SDR in 1988 was $1.34.

billion from SDR 2.4 billion in 1987. Such commitments had peaked at SDR 15.2 billion in 1981 and SDR 11.3 in 1983, declining to SDR 4.1 billion in 1984 and SDR 3.3 billion in 1985, before rising to SDR 3.7 in 1986.

Aggregate IMF general credit outstanding at the end of 1988 totaled SDR 25.5 billion, compared to SDR 29.2 billion at the end of 1987. Aggregate credit outstanding peaked in 1985 at a level of SDR 35.2 billion and fell to SDR 33.4 billion in 1986. This decline can be attributed both to improved economic performance and to net repayments on the high level of IMF lending during the 1982–1984 world recession and onset of the debt crisis.

Despite healthy growth in the industrialized countries and improved growth in some developing countries in 1988, many developing countries continued to face worsening debt servicing problems. In late 1988 arrears to the IMF reached a record total of SDR 2.6 billion, 80 percent of which was overdue 6 months or longer. Arrears are challenging the Fund's status as preferred creditor, weakening the IMF's financial position, eroding the monetary character of the Fund and potentially undermining the IMF's central role in the international financial system.

As in recent years, only developing countries borrowed IMF resources. In 1988 drawings under stand-by and extended programs accounted for roughly 70 percent of total drawings. These programs, developed jointly by member countries and the Fund, aim to achieve balance of payments viability in the medium term as the basis for sustainable noninflationary growth. In 1988 continuing its emphasis on growth-oriented economic reforms in its programs, the IMF approved 15 new stand-bys and 1 extended program, compared to 11 stand-bys and 1 extended program in 1987. At the end of 1988, 16 stand-by and 2 extended programs were active, compared to 22 stand-by and 2 extended programs at the end of 1987.

Drawings under the Compensatory Financing Facility (CFF) amounted to SDR 0.7 billion in 1988, down from SDR 1.2 billion in 1987 and returning to roughly the 1986 level of SDR 0.6 billion. The CFF was available to members facing payment difficulties stemming from temporary shortfalls in export earnings or surges in food import costs that were largely beyond the member's control. In 1988 the IMF established the Compensatory Contingency Financing Facility (CCFF), preserving the essential features of the CFF and providing resources for members facing adverse external developments that threaten their programs. In 1986–1988, drawings under the CFF averaged SDR 0.83 billion per annum, down from the SDR 2.1 billion level in the first 3 years of the decade.

In recent years, the IMF has recognized that its shorter term resources based on market-oriented interest rates are not well suited to addressing the protracted balance of payments and structural economic problems that often underlie low-income countries' balance of payments difficulties. To address this problem, in 1986 the IMF created the Structural Adjustment Facility (SAF) to provide assistance to low-income countries on concessional terms. Financed by repayment of IMF Trust Fund loans extended in the 1970's, SAF loans support 3-year adjustment programs in tandem with World Bank programs under a policy framework that eligible members develop jointly with both institutions. The longer duration of SAF programs and repayment of principal at concessional interest rates over 5 years, after a 5-year grace period, allow beneficiaries to undertake major structural policy reforms to promote sustainable growth.

At the 1987 Venice Summit, the Managing Director of the IMF called for a major increase in SAF resources, which the Summit Communique welcomed; and the IMF created the Enhanced SAF late that year. Surplus member countries' loans to the IMF totaling SDR 6 billion, combined with some members' grant contributions, enable the IMF to provide ESAF resources to the poorest countries, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa, at concessional rates. In the FY 90 budget formulated in late 1988, the U.S. Administration sought authorization and appropriation for a $150 million contribution to the ESAF.

In 1988 the IMF approved six new SAF programs with total commitments of SDR 310 million. A total of SDR 240 million was disbursed under 23 active SAF programs, compared to totals of SDR 100 million in 1986 and SDR 400 million in 1987. In 1988 the IMF approved six ESAF programs with total commitments of SDR 776 million; and ESAF drawings totaled SDR 160 million.

A total of 151 countries are members of the IMF. With the exception of the Soviet Union and several Eastern European countries, most developed and developing countries are members.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) was founded in 1977 with strong leadership from the United States. IFAD's mandate is to increase food production in the developing countries through loans for projects benefiting small farmers and landless poor. IFAD has been financed by a negotiated ratio of contributions from members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), as well as by smaller amounts from some of the more prosperous developing countries. IFAD has a unique governing structure that accords equal numbers of votes to the three groups of members—OECD (Category I), OPEC (Category II), and non-OPEC developing countries (Category III). Decisions have normally been made by consensus.

The President of IFAD is Idriss Jazairy from Algeria. The Vice President is a former U.S. development official, Donald Brown. IFAD has 98 professional staff positions. Of the 76 current professional employees, 8 are Americans. Two other senior officers, Chief of Administrative Services (Gordon Munson) and Director of IFAD Policy Review Division (Mohiuddin Alamgir), are U.S. citizens.

The Administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID) is the U.S. Governor on the IFAD Governing Council. The Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs in the Department of State is the U.S. Alternate Governor. The United States is the only country which occupies a permanent seat on IFAD's Executive Board, the body which approves projects and determines policy. All other countries take turns as members of the 36-member Board.

IFAD cofinances more than two-thirds of its portfolio with other multilateral institutions. The United States and other donors have encouraged cofinancing in order to increase the engagement of other international financial institutions in small farmer development activities. Many of IFAD's loans (36 percent) fund projects designed by other international lending institutions, chiefly the World Bank and the regional development banks, with input from IFAD specifically on the small farmer and landless laborer aspects.

Two-thirds of IFAD's resources are provided on highly concessional terms—1 percent interest, with 50-year repayment and 10-year grace periods. These terms are available to countries with a per capita GNP of $450 per year or less. Countries with a per capita GNP of $450 to $900 per year normally receive loans on intermediate terms of four percent interest, 5-year grace period and 20-year repayment. A few loans have been made on ordinary terms—8 percent interest, 3-year grace period and repayment in 15 to 18 years, all to countries with a per capita GNP over $900 per year.

During the 11th session of the Governing Council, held January 25–29 in Rome, IFAD celebrated its first decade of accomplishment. Guests included Pope John Paul II, Bangledeshi President Ershad, Italian Prime Minister Goria and Zambian President Kaunda, all of whom praised IFAD's outstanding record of support for the rural poor. The Acting U.S. Governor, U.S. AID Assistant Administrator Richard Bissell, complimented IFAD on its record of innovation as an institution for alleviating rural poverty and noted the importance of OECD/OPEC cooperation in providing the financial support for IFAD's activities.

IFAD's Special Program for Sub-Saharan African Countries Affected by Drought and Desertification had sought to generate an additional $300 million in voluntary contributions for a 5-year effort to rehabilitate the agricultural systems of countries most affected by drought and desertification. President Jazairy was able to announce to the Governing Council that pledges to the special program had exceeded the $300 million goal. (The United States contributed $10 million toward this special program.)

At its three meetings in 1988, the IFAD Executive Board approved 23 projects; a total of $242.5 million in new loans and grants was approved for project activities in 1988. (Figures based on 1 SDR = $1.34, which is the average 1988 Dollar rate for SDRs.) In FY 88, the United States contributed $30 million, leaving only $2.5 million more to be contributed to complete the $79,840,000 which it had pledged toward the second replenishment.

Throughout 1988, IFAD members conducted negotiations to reach agreement on the IFAD third replenishment. Although negotiations were not concluded by the end of 1988, members had agreed to continue efforts to reach a satisfactory funding level for the third replenishment. In an encouraging development, Category III developing countries set for themselves a surprisingly high target of a $75 million contribution in convertible currency.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), one of the largest UN specialized agencies, is the lead international organization in the fields of agriculture, fisheries and forestry. FAO's agriculture program attempts to bring about a sustained global improvement in nutrition levels, food security, and rural incomes, especially for the disadvantaged, through increasing rural productivity. Its fisheries program promotes improved management and utilization of the world's fishery resources, particularly by helping developing countries to increase their capacity to manage their marine and inland fisheries. The FAO forestry program assists member countries to find a balance between, on the one hand, environmental concerns and, on the other, both growing demands for forest goods and services and increasing pressures of agriculture on forest land. These FAO goals are consistent with the aims of U.S. bilateral development assistance programs.

FAO is governed by its Conference, to which all the member states of the organization belong. The Conference is held biennially in odd-numbered years to review FAO's performance and to adopt the Program of Work and Budget for the coming 2 years. Between Conference sessions, the 49-member FAO Council directs the work of the Organization. In even-numbered years, there are regional conferences in each of FAO's five geographic regions and a fall session of the Council. FAO is unusual among specialized agencies in that the Soviet Union is not a member. Having been a member of the 1944 Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, which was instrumental in the founding of FAO, the Soviet Union would need only to declare its desire to be a member of FAO, and it would become one without the necessity of a vote on its admission. The Soviet Union, however, has never opted to join.

FAO COUNCIL

The 94th session of the FAO Council was held in Rome, November 15-25. The first item considered by the Council was the financial situation of the organization. In his opening address, FAO Director General Edouard Saouma emphasized that the organization had reduced its programs by some $25 million during 1987 and $20 million in 1988 due to income shortfalls. Although the United States announced its FY 89 payment to FAO of $25 million, many members nevertheless leveled harsh criticism at the United States for its arrearages of $84 million. Despite objections to external borrowing by the United States and a number of other donor countries, the Council reconfirmed the authority of the Director General to borrow.

The locust plague in Africa and the Middle East elicited much attention, with the U.S. Delegation and those of other countries expressing satisfaction with FAO's role in coordinating the work of combating locusts. Council members from both developed and developing countries indicated their strong support for FAO's forestry activities, in particular FAO's role as the leading international coordinating agency for the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, and recommended that the Organization allocate an increased share of its regular program budget to forestry activities. The Council adopted a resolution to implement a plan of action for integrating women in development. Discussions on the state of food and agriculture and the report of the Committee on World Food Security centered on global cereal stocks; the U.S. Delegation alleviated some concern about reduced stocks by expressing the U.S. intent to meet all export and food aid commitments. The Council took up the topic of sustainable development for the first time, with delegations agreeing that sustainability is one of the major issues of our time and encouraging FAO to make greater progress in finding ways of translating the concept of sustainability into an operational reality.

In presenting the report on World Food Program activities for 1987, WFP Executive Director James Ingram highlighted the record amount of food shipped and delivered to needy people. The Council elected five member nations to the WFP Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs for 3-year terms from January 1, 1989, to December 31, 1991: the Congo, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Mexico and Zambia.

The Chairman of the Program Committee presented a progress report on the review of FAO, including the work of the outside experts assisting with the review, the status of the Secretariat's contracting of consultant firms to study certain aspects of personnel and financial management, and program budget reform. Most members of the Council expressed support for these reform efforts. The Council approved, on an experimental basis, a proposal by the Program and Finance Committees for the Director General to prepare a budget outline to present to a special joint meeting of the committees in January 1989. This budgetary reform measure had originated as a U.S. initiative.

FAO REGIONAL CONFERENCES

The 19th Regional Conference for the Near East was held in Muscat, Oman, March 13–17. Delegates across the whole spectrum of representation voiced a strong appeal for improved regional program cooperation. Libya took the lead in proposing that a FAO regional office for the region would greatly enhance regional coordination. This recommendation was strongly seconded by all delegations which spoke. The Secretariat noted that the decision to withdraw the regional office from Cairo to Rome had been taken by the 1979 FAO General Conference and could be reviewed by the 1989 General Conference. (The 1979 decision to withdraw the office from Cairo had been initiated by countries in the region in reaction to the Camp David accords.)

The 15th Regional Conference for Africa was held in Port Louis, Mauritius, April 26–May 4. The African locust plague was the major item of discussion, and the Conference urged donors to continue to mobilize all necessary resources to combat the locusts.

The Regional Conference for Asia and the Pacific held its 19th session in Bangkok, July 11–15. This is the only FAO Regional Conference of which the United States is a member. The country statement by the U.S. Delegation reviewed U.S. development assistance to the region, highlighted U.S. proposals before the GATT on agricultural trade, and provided an update on the U.S. drought and prospects for the U.S. grain harvest.

The 16th Regional Conference for Europe was held in Krakow, Poland, August 23–26. The agenda item on the environment was the main topic of debate, with the discussion centering on four common elements: (1) every country has serious problems with pollution, but the level of priority on pollution policy varies greatly; (2) there is a need for in-country, trans-border and international planning, including multilateral research and coordination with other international organizations; (3) some of the training in the use or chemicals must begin immediately; (4) severe governmental intervention must be used to discourage polluters through taxation or penalties assessed against them, even though enforcement may be difficult. The Conference adopted the Krakow Declaration as a statement of regional environmental goals.

The Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean held its 20th session in Recife, Brazil, October 2–8. The FAO Plan of Action for Agricultural and Rural Development in the region dominated the Conference agenda, and the themes of external debt and agricultural trade restrictions prevailed throughout most of the debate. The Conference adopted the FAO plan of action in conjunction with the Declaration of Recife, which calls on FAO to implement the plan for countries that request its implementation.

THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

Since its establishment in 1963, the World Food Program (WFP) has been the principal vehicle within the UN system for distributing food aid. The FAO and the United Nations jointly sponsor WFP. WFP distributes food commodities: (1) to support development projects (e.g., food-for-work projects) designed to produce social and economic progress; and (2) as emergency food assistance responding to natural and manmade disasters. Development projects make up approximately 75 percent of the total WFP program and emergency projects, the remaining 25 percent. WFP's long term goal is to help developing countries to become capable of producing or purchasing their national food requirements.

One aspect of social and economic progress is human resources development, which involves construction of schools, libraries, hospitals, etc., and improving nutrition through feeding school children and especially vulnerable groups like pregnant and nursing mothers. The most common implementation mechanism for WFP projects is "food-for-work." Food-for-work projects mobilize the unemployed for such tasks as clearing land, planting forests, building roads and the other types of construction just mentioned. In general, the laborers are paid, at least in part, with food commodities. The majority of WFP projects involve and therefore stimulate small-scale private sector participation in support of the development process.

WFP uses food aid to assist people adversely affected by structural adjustment programs. For example, WFP has targeted feeding programs to reach population groups whose real income has declined because of adjustment policies. As food subsidies decline, so does the real purchasing power of the poor. In these instances, WFP has sought those most in need of assistance as targets for food aid.

Within the UN system, the resources delivered by WFP are exceeded in value only by those provided by the World Bank. For calendar year 1988, WFP estimates the value of its expenditures in food and commodities at $575 million for regular development projects and $254 million for emergency operations. Administrative costs for headquarters staff and field projects were $60 million, making a total expenditure of some $890 million.

For the 1987–1988 biennium pledging period, WFP set an overall target of $1.4 billion, to include the value of commodities plus cash. As of December 31, 1988, $1,239,820,753 had been received. The top three donors were Canada, with a pledge of $256 million, the United States with $250 million, and the European Community with $147 million.

During fiscal year 1988, the United States contributed 695,000 metric tons of commodities worth $121 million and $56.1 million in transportation costs to the WFP regular program. The United States contributed 234,000 metric tons of commodities worth $36.1 million and $20 million in transportation costs to the International Emergency Food Reserve for WFP emergency feeding programs. Also, the United States contributed $740,000 to WFP for administrative expenses. WFP is the prime vehicle for U.S. multilateral food assistance efforts; WFP programs both complement and supplement U.S. bilateral efforts.

The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs

The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs (CFA) is the governing body of WFP. The CFA is composed of 30 members, elected for 3-year terms, with 10 members elected annually. ECOSOC elects half of the members, and the FAO Council elects the remaining half. The United States and some other major donors are regularly reelected to the CFA. At the November 1986 meeting of the FAO Council, the United States was reelected to the CFA for a 3-year term beginning January 1, 1987.

The CFA meets twice a year to review WFP projects and resource commitments and to discuss WFP program and budgetary issues. WFP operates on a 2-year cycle for budgeting, programming and planning purposes. Donors pledge resources to WFP on a biennial basis. In 1987, for the 13th biennium (1989–1990), WFP established a pledge target of $405 million in cash and 3.25 million tons of food, making the total cash value of the pledge target $1.4 billion. Members contribute in cash or commodities, or both. The United States has pledged $300 million in cash and commodities toward the WFP 1989–1990 biennium regular and emergency programs.

The 25th session of the CFA met in Rome from May 30 to June 9. The opening session was devoted to a commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the World Food Program. Speakers included the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Giolio Andreotti, Senator George McGovern of the United States, who was instrumental in founding the WFP, Edouard Saouma, Director-General of FAO, and James Ingram, Executive Director of WFP.

In the opening address of the CFA, Executive Director James Ingram noted that 1987 had been a record year for WFP with nearly 2.5 million tons of food shipped at a transport expenditure of $141 million. Ingram pointed out that WFP's increased role as coordinator and organizer of the in-country movement of food is adding a new dimension to the organization's basic activity. He noted that in major emergency situations, such as the drought in Ethiopia, feeding of Mozambique refugees in Malawi, or the need to convoy food into southern Sudan, the WFP had been effective because of its strength in logistics.

During the CFA meetings, new projects and extensions of projects were approved for a total value of $465.5 million, of which approximately 77 percent was for low-income food-deficit countries. Projects for agriculture, forestry and rural development accounted for 53 percent of the total. The CFA adopted a Nordic resolution concerning the world-wide deterioration of the environment and continuing food security problems. The resolution requested the Executive Director to prepare a report on the contribution of WFP toward meeting General Assembly resolutions 42/186 and 42/187 of December 11, 1987, on sustainable growth.

After much study and discussion, a new method of work for project presentation was adopted for a 3-year trial period. The new method limits the number of participants in project review sessions in the hope that a smaller group will be able to give more careful consideration to the technical details of projects. The CFA chairman announced that in accordance with the revised method of work adopted by the CFA, the newly established Subcommittee on Projects (SCP) would meet in December, to be followed by a 1-day CFA meeting to examine and approve the work of the subcommittee.

Following the June 3 session of the CFA, Executive Director Ingram called a special meeting of donors to emphasize the need for more donations, due to extraordinary demands on WFP's emergency programs brought on by refugee and displaced person operations, as well as by drought and natural disasters.

The first session of the WFP Subcommittee on Projects and the 26th session of the CFA were held in Rome December 5–12. During the meetings, 18 new projects and 9 project extensions were approved for a total cost to WFP of $278.6 million.

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

The United States was a founding member of UNESCO and continues to believe in the principles embodied in its constitution. Today, as in UNESCO's early years, it believes that international cooperation in education, science and culture can be a positive element in building a peaceful world.

The United States maintained its observer status with UNESCO during 1988. The U.S. Observer Mission promotes residual U.S. interests at UNESCO and works with Secretariat officials and representatives of other countries to encourage reform within the Organization. During 1988 the United States sent observer delegations to the 129th and 130th sessions of UNESCO's Executive Board and participated in the work of the Paris-based Western Information Group, the Western Electoral Group, and the Geneva Group.

The mandate of the Reform Observation Panel (ROP) for UNESCO expired at the end of March 1988. The Panel was established by the Secretary of State in 1985 "to assess and report on the UNESCO reform process and to encourage reform efforts that advance continuing U.S. interests." Mr. Leonard Marks served as Chairman. The panel submitted its report to the Secretary of State on March 30, 1988. It recommended that the broad criteria for the kind of change within UNESCO that could lead to consideration of reentry should be: sustained budgetary and financial discipline; thorough reform of the UNESCO Secretariat; and major programmatic changes, including the termination of tendentious and politically motivated programs.

The United States established an open, frank and constructive dialogue with Director General Federico Mayor during 1988. Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs Richard S. Williamson met with him twice and Deputy Assistant Secretary Penny Eastman met with him six times. On each occasion they encouraged him in his reform efforts. For his part, Mayor was open to U.S. reform proposals. During his first year in office, Mayor attempted to depoliticize the program, upgrade the staff, introduce management reform and base UNESCO's policy direction and program action firmly on its constitution.

Mayor tried, in particular, to neutralize the New World Information and Communication Order by turning the organization's activities away from it and concentrating on building the infrastructures needed to make the free flow of information and ideas a reality. He also reaffirmed the primacy of fundamental human rights.

Mayor devoted considerable energy during 1988 to preparing the draft Medium-Term Plan which will chart UNESCO's course for the 6-year period 1990–1995. The U.S. Government will study the plan when it is completed in April 1989 and observe with interest whether or not the UNESCO General Conference adopts it and other reforms when it meets late in 1989.

During 1988 the United States remained a party to the following UNESCO-related Agreements and Conventions:

— The Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural character, with Protocol (Beirut Agreement), done at Lake Success, July 15, 1949;

— The Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, with Protocol, (Florence Agreement), done at Lake Success, November 22, 1950;

— The Universal Copyright Convention and Protocols 1, 2 and 3 Annexed thereto, done at Geneva, September 6, 1952;

— The Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States, adopted at Paris, December 3, 1958;

— The Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its 16th session on November 14, 1979;

— The Universal Copyright Convention as revised at Paris on July 14, 1971, and Protocols 1 and 2 Annexed thereto, adopted on July 14, 1971, by an International Conference of States Convened by UNESCO;

— The Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms done at Geneva, October 29, 1971; and

— The Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage done at Paris, November 16, 1972.

The United States also participated in the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and the International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP). The regulations governing these UNESCO-related bodies allow participation of non-UNESCO member states.

The United States made voluntary contributions, through the International Convention and Scientific Organizations Account, of approximately $2 million to these intergovernmental bodies as well as to selected international scientific or cultural activities in UNESCO's fields of competence considered important to U.S. interests. In the past, financing for these purposes was provided by U.S. annual contributions to UNESCO. Among other bodies or activities funded were the Man and the Biosphere Program, and international activities in library and information science. A separate contribution was made to the World Heritage Fund.

UNESCO CONVENTION ON THE MEANS OF PROHIBITING AND PREVENTING THE ILLICIT IMPORT, EXPORT AND TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

During 1988 the United States carried out its obligations under the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property in a number of ways. Import restrictions imposed on Pre-Columbian artifacts from El Salvador's Cara Sucia region in 1987 continued to be enforced by the U.S. Customs Service. In addition, the U.S. Customs Service seized a number of stolen artifacts and returned them to their countries of origin.

During the year, the United States received its second official request for assistance under Article 9 of the convention. The Government of Bolivia sought emergency U.S. import restrictions to help protect the record of the Aymara culture which was being subjected to dispersal and fragmentation of crisis proportions by the illegal taking and export of antique textiles belonging to the Andean community of Coroma. (Upon the unanimous recommendation of the President's Cultural Property Advisory Committee, such import controls were imposed on March 14, 1989.)

U.S. actions under this convention are authorized by the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (PL 97-446). The United States is the only major art importing country to implement the convention. Most of the Presidential functions in the Act are carried out by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, who acts in consultation with the Secretaries of State and Treasury. The Secretary of State is responsible for negotiating bilateral and multilateral agreements under the Act. Enforcement is the responsibility of the U.S. Commissioner of Customs.

UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION

The International Copyright activities of UNESCO, conducted primarily in association with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), addressed a variety of issues of importance to American copyright interests.

In April 1988 a committee of governmental experts met at UNESCO headquarters in Paris to consider a number of copyright questions with a view to the drafting of principles for the guidance of national legislation with regard to the copyright protection of photographic works.

A committee of governmental experts met at WIPO headquarters in Geneva between June 27 and July 1 to reexamine the principles of protection worked out for eight categories of works during the 1986–1987 biennium (printed works, audiovisual works, phonograms, works of art, works of architecture, works of applied art, dramatic and choreographic works, musical works) and for photographic works in 1988.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION

The 115 member Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) is the only intergovernmental body for coordinating oceanographic programs on a global scale. U.S. membership provides a unique mechanism for promoting U.S. interests in a number of high-priority areas.

The IOC is responsible for intergovernmental coordination of a number of global programs essential for the collection of data to support the oceanographic component of the World Climate Research Program. The Marine Pollution Research and Monitoring Program for global assessment of oceanic contaminants and biological effects of pollution is expected to provide a scientific basis for regulatory actions under various international conventions—e.g., the London Dumping Convention. The IOC cooperates closely in this program area with the UN Environment Program (UNEP).

The IOC's Tsunami Warning System monitors earthquakes in the Pacific and warns of resulting tsunami (tidal wave) travel time and impact. U.S. interests in the Pacific and West Coast states benefit directly. In addition, support through the IOC for the International Tsunami Information Center in Honolulu is $5.25 million annually.

A project of particular interest to the United States is the International Bathymetric Chart of the Caribbean, the first phase of a longer term project for geological and geophysical mapping of the region. The United States will acquire new, higher quality charts of its own economic zone, as well as others, at a fraction of the cost of a U.S. effort.

Cost savings derived by the United States through the IOC Oceanographic Data Exchange program are estimated at $3.57 billion (archive replacement value) for bathymetric and oceanographic data. For 1985 alone, the value was $116 million. Most data for Soviet and Eastern countries are not available, except through this mechanism.

The global Sea-level Observing System, a global network of 250 sea-level monitoring stations, is being implemented to provide data essential for climate research, and for calibration and validation of U.S. satellite observing systems scheduled for launching in the early 1990's. The IOC also helps to coordinate a global system of real-time marine meteorological and oceanographic observations used by U.S. forecasters for medium and long-range forecasts, and by U.S. shipping and maritime interests to promote safety at sea.

Strong leadership in IOC subsidiary bodies is maintained by U.S. national coordinators for IOC programs through the Interagency Panel for International Programs and Intergovernmental Cooperation in Ocean Affairs (PIPICO). In 1988 U.S. Delegations participated in a number of IOC meetings, workshops, and symposia to address the planning and coordination of IOC's global and regional programs.

INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CORRELATION PROGRAM

The International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP), established in 1973, is a multinational, multidisciplinary research program in the geological sciences sponsored jointly by the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Currently, there are 52 projects on a broad range of geological topics. The emphasis has been on projects that enhance regional, continental, or worldwide stratigraphic correlation of rock sequences of all ages, but the Program also includes projects on geochemistry, marine geology, geological data management techniques, genesis of ore deposits, paleoclimatology, tectonics and remote sensing. A secondary objective of many IGCP projects is to improve geological capability and knowledge in developing countries.

A 15-member Board of distinguished scientists from as many countries, appointed jointly by IUGS and UNESCO, provides policy for the Program, with the help of the advisory Scientific Committee. The Board and Scientific Committee meet annually at the IGCP Secretariat in Paris. Forty-seven of the 90 countries which formally participate in IGCP have organized domestic working groups for selected projects and national committees to coordinate the research efforts of these groups and to promote each country's involvement in the program.

Funds to support coordination of IGCP activities in the United States and foreign travel were provided during 1988 by a grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF) to the American Geological Institute. The annual grant of $75,000 was the eighth to be provided by NSF, bringing its total contribution to IGCP activities to nearly $525,000.

Project 206, which addresses the synthesis of current knowledge on the characteristics and neotectonic histories of selected major active faults is a good example of a successful and timely project involving geological hazards. The synthesis will be developed in a way to facilitate the comparison and contrast of major active faults in a variety of tectonic settings and will be in two parts: an atlas of maps and illustrations for each fault zone and a summary discussion volume of the methods and results of neotectonic studies of each fault zone.

In 1988 the project members convened in Santiago, Chile, in conjunction with the Fifth Chilean Geological Congress, and a committee was organized to develop a proposal to undertake a neotectonic synthesis of the South American Andes. The proposal is to be submitted to Working Group I of the International Lithosphere Program. The proposed project will build on the professional contacts and data developed by the parent project. It will encourage further research in all seven Andean countries including Bolivia, Chile, Colombia and Ecuador. A major goal will be the development of a body of knowledge that will contribute to an evaluation of seismic risk from crustal earthquakes.

Project 206 is a prototype of work that will be done under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences and the UN plan that designates the 1990's as the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction.

MAN AND THE BIOSPHERE

During 1988 U.S. scientists, as individuals and as members of the U.S. and the Biosphere Program (U.S. MAB), continued to collaborate with the UNESCO MAB Program and with other programs and agencies of the United Nations.

The Chairman of the U.S. MAB Program was an official observer to the 10th International Coordinating Council (ICC) of the UNESCO MAB Program. At the scientific symposium portion of the ICC meetings, he gave a plenary address on biological diversity and global change.

Funds that the Department of State contributed from the voluntary contributions section of the Foreign Assistance Act were granted to U.S. MAB to support several new international research and project initiatives which involved coordinated and complementary activities and funding from UNESCO and from other UN programs. Additionally, during 1988, significant progress was achieved on several projects which had previously received initial funding from the voluntary contributions section of the Foreign Assistance Act.

U.S. and Chinese scientists achieved significant progress on a U.S./UNESCO research project on comparative process measurements, modeling and applications synthesis on broad leaf biosphere reserves. U.S. scientists made three visits to various research and ecological modeling institutes in China. Detailed work plans and work schedules were agreed upon for all of the four subcomponents of this project and the Chinese scientists have obtained funding for their return visits to the similar U.S. research institutes involved. The project's progress reports note that

> ... there is a very strong commitment to implementing and integrating the research at the (U.S. and China) field sites and a commitment by leadership at both of the institutes (Shenyang and Chang-bai) to seeing that the integration takes place; a critical mass of field, mathematical and computer capabilities appears to be in place already in Shenyang and the South China Institute of Biology ...

Also related to collaborative work in China, during 1988, U.S. and UNESCO personnel produced a manuscript resulting from a U.S./UNESCO MAB symposium and workshop projects on watershed and forestry management in China. This work will be published by the U.S. MAB Program during 1989.

U.S. scientists, in coordination with UNESCO editors, completed a manuscript on the eutrophication of lakes which will soon be published by UNESCO under its newly established scientific book series. U.S. and UNESCO scientists worked together to finish a manuscript on land/inland ecotone in landscape management and restoration, which is a product of collaborative funding and program activities between the U.S. and UNESCO MAB Programs. It is intended that this document will form one of the early issues of the MAB Digest Series that is to be launched during 1989.

The U.S. and UNESCO MAB Programs also cofunded a tropical forest project on tropical species diversity, economic diversification and integrated conservation strategies in Kinabalu, Malaysia and Xishuangbana, China. This project will construct walkways in the canopies of the tropical forest for both scientific research work and to attract tourism. Other U.S./UNESCO cooperative MAB activities were funded in Bolivia by both U.S. and UNESCO MAB through the Smithsonian Institution to train Bolivian scientists in the monitoring of the biological diversity of the biosphere reserve through the use of a standardized inventory protocol which was developed under the agreement establishing the UNESCO/Smithsonian Biological Diversity Program.

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

The United States initiated the development of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage and was the first nation to ratify it in December 1973.

In October 1987 the United States was elected, by more votes than any other country, to a 6-year term on the World Heritage Committee, the 21-member governing body of the Convention. The Convention has over 100 signatories and is the largest international body working to protect mankind's natural and cultural heritage.

The World Heritage List is a compendium of natural areas and cultural sites, now 315 in number, considered to have universal significance for all mankind. Seventeen U.S. sites, including the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone National Park and the Statue of Liberty are on the World Heritage List.

The United States made a voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund of $220,000 in both 1988 and 1989, respectively. The Convention and its Fund, which assist needy countries, have enabled many nations to preserve their unique natural and cultural legacies. Measures taken by member countries to protect natural sites often contribute to the preservation of endangered species and biological diversity.

U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

The membership of all Commissioners expired at the end of 1985. Given the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO, there has been no Commission activity since then.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was established by a convention signed at Stockholm in 1967 which entered into force on April 26, 1970. The United States is a party to the Convention, which has 123 member states. WIPO is the principal worldwide organization responsible for promoting the protection of intellectual property, which comprises two elements: copyrights (mainly literary and artistic works) and industrial property (mainly patents on inventions, trademarks and industrial designs). WIPO is also responsible for the administration of some 15 intergovernmental "Unions," each founded on a multilateral treaty. The two principal treaties are the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which has 99 parties, and the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, to which 81 nations have adhered. The United States has been a party to the former Convention since 1887. In 1988 it took the necessary steps to adhere to the Berne Convention, effective March 1, 1989.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Paris and Berne Conventions had provided for an international bureau to serve as Secretariat for each respective Union. These were united in 1893, eventually under the name of the United International Bureaux for the Protection of Intellectual Property (BIRPI). Although BIRPI still has a legal existence for states that are members of one of the Unions but not of WIPO, in practice it has been supplanted by the International Bureau established by the Stockholm Convention to be the Secretariat of WIPO. WIPO became a specialized agency of the United Nations in 1974.

The International Bureau operates under the direction of WIPO member states through a General Assembly and an annual Conference. The principal administrative organs of the Paris and Berne Unions are the Assemblies of each Union, consisting of all the member states. The Paris and Berne Unions elect Executive Committees from among their member states, and the joint membership of these two Committees constitutes WIPO's Coordination Committee. It meets annually and is entrusted with the normal tasks of such a governing body, especially the implementation of WIPO's biennial program and budget. As a member of the Paris Union Executive Committee, the United States continued as a member of the WIPO Coordination Committee through 1988.

During the year, the United States was also a member of the WIPO General Assembly and the following committees: the Budget Committee, the Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights, the Permanent Committee on Industrial Property Information and the Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property.

One of two basic objectives of WIPO is to promote the protection of intellectual property on a worldwide basis. In support of this objective, WIPO encourages the conclusion of new international treaties and the harmonization of national laws; it gives legal-technical assistance to developing countries; it assembles and disseminates information on intellectual property; it maintains international registration services in the fields of trademarks, industrial designs and appellations of origin; and it performs the administrative tasks for an international patent filing arrangement.

The second basic objective of.WIPO is to ensure administrative cooperation among the Unions. Centralizing the administration of the various Unions in the International Bureau helps ensure economy both for the member states and for the private sector concerned with intellectual property.

Member nations contribute to six of the WIPO Unions, known as the Program Unions. WIPO's 1988–1989 biennial gross assessed budget for the Program Unions is 47,399,000 Swiss francs. It represents a slight increase over the 1986–1987 budget. The United States is assessed approximately 3.9 percent of total assessments.

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

The Permanent Committee for Patent Information, established in 1977, was renamed the Permanent Committee for Industrial Property Information. It continues to coordinate all technical activities in regard to international patent classification and cooperation.

ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Activities of WIPO in the field of development cooperation with respect to developing countries continued in 1988 under the direction of two committees composed of developed and developing countries, the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights and the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property. The United States participates in both of these committees and supports most of their activities, which are numerous and varied.

During 1988 WIPO continued to provide traineeships to officials from developing countries in the fields of industrial property and copyright. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office participated by providing training to a number of developing country nationals in the industrial property field.

REVISION OF THE PARIS CONVENTION

The United States continued its active participation in the revision of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, the most important multilateral treaty in this field. Four sessions of a diplomatic conference, held from 1980 to 1984, failed to resolve questions concerning a voting procedure for adoption of a revision (the United States prefers unanimous consent), issues relating to sanctions for not working a patent in a given country, and trademark issues concerning the use of geographical names to identify products. The Assembly of the Paris Union decided that consultations aimed at improving the prospects for positive results should precede a fifth session of the diplomatic conference. Consultative meetings were held in June 1985, January, May and September 1987, and September 1988. No conclusions were reached regarding the convening of a fifth session of the diplomatic conference.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

A total of 41 countries have ratified or adhered to the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). Under the PCT, U.S. citizens and residents may file an international patent application with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in Washington. The effect of the international application is the same as if national applications had been concurrently filed with national Patent Offices (including the European Patent Office) of those countries party to the PCT that the applicant designates. The international application is then subjected to a search of prior art by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and the applicant then decides, on the basis of the international search report, whether it is worthwhile to pursue applications in the various countries designated. National procedures in such countries are delayed until 20 months after the priority date, unless the applicant asks for an earlier start. National procedures may be delayed until 30 months after the priority date if the applicant requests an examination in addition to a search.

BRUSSELS SATELLITE CONVENTION

On March 7, 1985, the United States became a party to the Convention Relating to the Distribution of Program-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite (Brussels Satellite Convention). This Convention obliges each contracting state to take adequate and effective measures to prevent the unauthorized distribution on or from its territory of any program-carrying signal transmitted by a nondirect broadcast satellite. While only 12 countries are party to the Convention, they include the predominant users of international satellite communications facilities. It is a most important agreement with respect to piracy of satellite television signals. The United States is encouraging other countries to join the Brussels Convention.

REGISTRATION OF AUDIOVISUAL WORKS

WIPO has been moving toward a treaty establishing an International Register of audiovisual works which would substantially benefit the world's motion picture industries. A periodic Gazette would enable them to determine the rights available and who owns them, and assist in preventing piracy.

At its first session in March 1988 a Committee of Experts concluded that establishment of the Register was "highly desirable and urgent" and recommended that a diplomatic conference be convened as soon as possible. The WIPO Governing Bodies in September 1988 unanimously approved a second Committee of Experts meeting in November 1988 and the convening of a diplomatic conference during the first half of 1989.

At the November 1988 Experts session, in which representatives of the American Film Marketing Association (AFMA) (attached to the International Federation of Film Producers Associations) played a very active role, the draft Treaty and Regulations were further refined. The Committee recommended that the proposed treaty be presented to the diplomatic conference, which the Director General announced would be held in Geneva, April 10–21, 1989.

PROTECTION OF INTEGRATED CIRCUITS

Existing intellectual property arrangements have appeared inappropriate and insufficient in protecting the designs of semiconductor chip products. The United States and Japan, by far the world's leading producers of integrated circuits and semiconductor chip products (accounting for about 80 percent of the total), have enacted their own unique legislation to protect such designs, the United States in 1984 and Japan in 1985.

WIPO has proposed conclusion of a treaty offering specific protection for such intellectual property. Versions of its draft treaty were considered by a Committee of Experts at four sessions, in November 1985, June 1986, April

1987, and November 1988. A series of consultations with experts also was held, in February 1986 and January and May 1988. The developing nations, concerned about the ramifications of a treaty, had asked for a series of reports and meetings so that they could become better informed about the issues involved.

Despite G-77 efforts to slow proceedings, WIPO has moved rapidly to conclude an agreement, and at the November 1988 Experts meeting the developed nations indicated their belief that the time was ripe for a diplomatic conference. A preparatory meeting immediately following the Experts session paved the way for the conference, scheduled to be held in Washington May 8–26, 1989.

World Health Organization (WHO)

The World Health Organization (WHO) in 1988 celebrated its 40th anniversary and elected a new Director General. President Reagan and Vice President Bush paid special tribute to WHO in statements issued on "UN Day," when WHO was given special honor during a concert at the Kennedy Center in Washington. In the course of the year, WHO continued its work to coordinate the global attack on the pandemic of acquired immuno-deficiency syndrome (AIDS), and extended its efforts toward its overall goal of "health for all by the year 2000." The U.S. Government made a substantial payment against arrearages in payment of U.S. assessments, which helped to alleviate financial difficulties experience by WHO.

U.S. PARTICIPATION

The United States maintained its role as one of the most active of WHO's 166 member states. U.S. Delegations took leading positions on many issues at the annual World Health Assembly—including AIDS, drug abuse, eradication of polio and pharmaceuticals—and U.S. Government agencies continued to supply many technical consultants and advisors to WHO to assist with its work in numerous substantive health fields.

The U.S. Delegation to the 41st World Health Assembly, held in Geneva on May 2–13, was headed by Donald Newman, Under Secretary of Health and Human Services. The Delegation included Dr. Robert Windom, DHHS Assistant Secretary for Health; Joseph C. Petrone, U.S. Ambassador to the UN office in Geneva; Neil A. Boyer, Director for Health and Transportation Programs in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State; Dr. Nyle C. Brady, Senior Assistant Administrator, U.S. AID; and Dr. Frank E. Young, Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

Under Secretary Newman, in his address to the full Assembly in general debate, paid special tribute to WHO on its 40th anniversary. "The United States is proud to associate itself with the worldwide celebration," he said.

"We pledge our continued support to and participation in its every effort in the preservation of human life, health and dignity."

From January 11 to 20, the United States sent a delegation to the major business meeting of the WHO Executive Board. The chief action at the meeting was to select a nominee for the post of Director General. The U.S. Delegation to the meeting was headed by Dr. Young, the U.S. member of the Board. Dr. Young also headed the U.S. Delegation to a 2-day reorganization meeting of the Board on May 16–17, 1988, following the World Health Assembly, and to the meeting of the Board's Program Committee, held in Geneva from October 8 to 14.

At the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), which also serves as the WHO regional office for the Americas, Assistant Secretary Windom headed the delegation to the 33rd meeting of the Directing Council, which consists of senior officials from all 38 member governments, on September 26–30. U.S. Delegations also attended meetings of the nine-member PAHO Executive Committee, on June 27–30 and October 1, as well as meetings of the PAHO Subcommittee on Planning and Programming, on April 6–8 and December 7–8.

Assistant Secretary Windom also headed the U.S. Delegation to the 39th meeting of the WHO regional committee for the Western Pacific, held in Manila, the Philippines, on September 12–16, and then attended, as an observer, the meeting of the regional committee for the South East Asian region, in New Delhi, India. The United States sent an observer delegation to the annual meeting of the regional committee for Europe, held in Copenhagen, Denmark, on September 12–17. A delegation was sent to the 29th meeting of the Governing Council of WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), held on April 28–29, in Lyon, France.

DIRECTOR GENERAL ELECTION

The World Health Assembly in May elected Dr. Hiroshi Nakajima, of Japan, as Director General of WHO, for a 5-year period beginning July 21, 1988. Dr. Nakajima, only the fourth Director General in WHO's 40-year history, had served the preceding 9 years as WHO regional director for the Western Pacific. Born May 16, 1928, Dr. Nakajima was educated in Tokyo and Paris, with a specialty in neuropsychiatry and pharmacology. He joined WHO in 1973 and served as Chief of Drug Policies and Management before being elected by the regional committee for the Western Pacific to be the new regional director, beginning in 1979.

Under WHO's constitution and rules of procedure, the 31-member Executive Board formally nominates the Director General. At its meeting in January, the Board gave consideration to four individuals, all WHO regional directors, who had introduced their candidacies. In addition to Dr. Nakajima, they were Dr. Hussein Al-Gezairy of Saudi Arabia, director of the WHO Eastern Mediterranean office, in Alexandria, Egypt; Dr. Carlyle Guerra de Macedo of Brazil, director of the WHO regional office for the Americas and of the Pan American Health Organization, in Washington; and Dr. Gottlieb Monekosso, director of the African regional office, in Brazzaville, the Congo. Incumbent Director General Halfdan Mahler, of Denmark, informed the Board by letter that he did not wish to be considered for renewal of his tenure, which had begun in 1973.

The United States had announced in September 1987 that it would support the candidacy of Dr. Macedo of Brazil, director of the regional group in which the United States has its principal membership. Under the rules of the Board, if no candidate receives the required majority, the one with the fewest votes is eliminated and the Board then votes again. At the Executive Board session, on the third ballot, in secret voting, Dr. Nakajima defeated Dr. Macedo. The voting was as follows: First ballot: Macedo 11, Nakajima 9, Monekosso 6, Al-Gezairy 5. Second ballot: Macedo 12, Nakajima 12, Monekosso 7. Third ballot: Nakajima 17, Macedo 13, abstaining 1. In the secret ballot at the World Health Assembly on May 4, the Board's nomination of Dr. Nakajima for a 5-year term was formally approved by a vote of 151 to 1, with 1 abstaining.

After Dr. Nakajima read the oath of office before the full Assembly plenary, U.S. Chief Delegate Newman took the floor to extend, on behalf of the U.S. Government, warm congratulations to Dr. Nakajima. "We are confident," Under Secretary Newman said, "that under his leadership, this organization will make still greater contributions to the improvement of the health of people everywhere and in the pursuit of WHO's noble goal of 'health for all.' I want to assure Dr. Nakajima that my government stands ready to assist in any way we can and to support his efforts fully in improving and promoting health throughout the world." Following this intervention, 82 other delegates spoke for more than 2 hours to congratulate Dr. Nakajima and to praise the work of out-going Director General Mahler.

The Health Assembly then unanimously approved a resolution declaring Dr. Mahler to be "Director General Emeritus," and gave him a long standing ovation. In an address to the Assembly, Dr. Mahler stressed the need for "morally responsible leadership" in WHO to continue, including the emphasis on the goal of "health for all." In his closing statement, he said, "let me conclude by paraphrasing one of my favorite statements by George Bernard Shaw: 'The problems of our world cannot be solved by skeptics or cynics whose horizons are limited by obvious realities. We need women and men who can dream of things that never were and ask why not.' Health for all. Why not!"

Dr. Nakajima formally took office on July 21. He made several visits to the United States, and was welcomed by Secretary of Health and Human Services Otis Bowen; Under Secretary Newman; Surgeon General Koop; Deputy

Secretary of State John Whitehead; Under Secretary Michael Armacost; and Alan Woods, Administrator of U.S. AID, among others.

In September the WHO regional committee for the Western Pacific met in Manila to elect a successor to Dr. Nakajima as regional director. There were two candidates: Dr. Sang-Tae (S.T.) Han, of the Republic of Korea, had joined WHO in 1967 and for the last 9 years had served as the Director of Program Management in the WHO Manila office, as principal deputy to Dr. Nakajima; he had been named "special representative of the Director General" after Dr. Nakajima was elected Director General. Dr. Abdul Khalid bin Sahan, Director General of Health of Malaysia, for many years had been active in WHO affairs, including service as vice chairman of its Executive Board and delegate to many global and regional meetings. The United States supported the candidacy of Dr. Han. On September 15, the regional committee nominated Dr. Han to the post. The secret ballot vote was 16 for Dr. Han, 7 for Dr. Khalid, and one abstaining. (Dr Han's nomination for a 5-year term was confirmed by the WHO Executive Board in January 1989.)

WHO'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

A special session of the World Health Assembly in May gave opportunity to delegates to pay special tribute to the successes of WHO over its 40-year history. Other events throughout the year continued the public focus on these achievements.

Dr. Nakajima addressed the UN General Assembly on October 27, in a celebration of the 40th anniversary, and, in enumerating the many activities of WHO, pointed out that they "touch the whole lifetime of the individual, from infancy to old age." Describing the challenges for the 1990s, Dr. Nakajima said that "many of the world's major health problems and premature deaths are preventable through changes in human behavior and at low cost. We have the know-how and technology, but they have to be transformed into effective action at the community level."

On October 29, WHO was the specially honored agency at the 28th Annual UN Concert and Dinner, organized by the UN Association of the United States of America for "UN Day." Dr. Nakajima was the guest of honor at the concert in the Kennedy Center, and the guest speaker at a reception in the Department of State on the preceding evening. In the program prepared for the event, President Reagan made the following comment:

> WHO has been one of the United Nations' significant success stories. Through four decades it has combatted disease, improved cooperation and information exchange among health officials from member nations, and promoted the well-being of people on every part of the globe. Its experience in fighting worldwide epidemics is a major asset in the current drive to halt the spread of the devastating AIDS virus. I commend the scientists, physicians, statisticians, economists and legions of other specialists who have joined forces under the auspices of WHO to help achieve the goal of "health for all by the year 2000."

In the same document, Vice President Bush said that

> WHO has been the principal forum in which governments all across the globe seek to build an international health infrastructure. WHO has played an invaluable role in ensuring the success of economic and social development around the world. However, the challenges for WHO today remain as great as those faced 40 years ago when WHO was founded. AIDS, in particular, is a grave threat to global health, affecting industrialized and developing nations alike.

Mr. Bush also gave special attention to the need for improvement of vaccines for diseases endemic in developing countries. "These are but a few examples of what we must conquer to achieve WHO's goal of 'health for all by the year 2000,' " he said.

HEALTH ISSUES

During the year, WHO continued its efforts to improve action on many pressing health issues, and the World Health Assembly addressed AIDS, polio eradication, smoking, pharmaceuticals, infant nutrition, drug abuse and epidemiology, as well as other health issues.

AIDS

The Assembly gave extended attention to AIDS in the general debate statements by chiefs of delegation and in formal committee sessions. Dr. Jonathan Mann, director of the Global Program on AIDS, convened an informal meeting of delegates to explain research progress. Dr. Mann is an officer of the U.S. Public Health Service, detailed from the Centers for Disease Control to WHO. After extended committee negotiations, the Assembly also adopted a resolution on "avoidance of discrimination in relation to HIV-infected people and people with AIDS." HIV is the human immuno-deficiency virus.

On October 27, at a special session of the UN General Assembly, Director General Nakajima reported that

> . . . together we have succeeded in mobilizing countries around the world . . . in a coordinated and increasingly effective global fight against AIDS. I will ensure that WHO provides creative and effective leadership for this worldwide effort. This work has only started, but . . . we will prevail over AIDS.

On the same occasion, U.S. Surgeon General Koop noted that

> AIDS is potentially more destructive to developing nations than to the developed or industrialized world. AIDS tends to impact most often on the most productive members of society—the breadwinners in the prime of their lives. Hence developing nations hit by AIDS could lose an irreplaceable generation of engineers, health workers, teachers and government officials, as well as workers in agriculture, industry and trade. AIDS has the potential to devastate a country's plans for development.

Dr. Koop said that

> . . . no country can fight AIDS on its own. The leadership necessary to coordinate our efforts can only come from the World Health Organization. WHO is the linchpin holding together our

> individual efforts and guiding them into a genuinely unified global attack on AIDS.

The UN General Assembly, on October 27, adopted resolution A/RES/43/15, which, *inter alia,*

> . . . reaffirms the established leadership and the essential role of the World Health Organization in the global direction and coordination of AIDS prevention, control, research and education . . . and urges all appropriate organizations of the United Nations system . . . to continue to support the world-wide struggle against AIDS.

WHO declared December 1, to be "World AIDS Day" and held a special ceremony in Geneva to mark the event. Pearl Bailey, public member of the U.S. Delegation to the UN General Assembly, was the official guest of the World Health Organization. In her presentation, she said,

> . . . we must falsify the lie that AIDS is 'unconquerable.' Somewhere in the world a man or woman will, by the grace of God, become filled with the knowledge that will save humanity. Through our combined efforts, it can and must be done if mankind is to survive this terrible pestilence.

In the course of 1988, WHO created a new Management Committee on AIDS, which held its first meeting at WHO headquarters on November 7–9. The committee consisted of representatives of countries that had made major voluntary contributions to the Global Program on AIDS (GPA). The U.S. Representatives were led by Bradshaw Langmaid, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science and Technology, of U.S. AID.

A report prepared for the session showed that, as of October 10, WHO's Global Program on AIDS had received $29.5 million in 1987 and $39.5 million in 1988, as well as an additional $10.2 million in pledges in 1988, for a 1987–1988 total of $79.2 million in cash and pledges. Contributions were provided by 16 nations as well as UNDP. U.S. AID obligated $5.5 million for this program in 1987 and $15 million in 1988. By the end of October 1988, the Program had established positions for 112 staff members and expected to have 222 posts by the end of 1989.

To help disseminate knowledge of the developments in the fight against AIDS, PAHO held its second Pan American Teleconference on AIDS, on December 12–14. The program, transmitted live via satellite from Rio de Janeiro, was expected to reach more than 100,000 health specialists in 28 countries of the Western Hemisphere, at fixed sites from Canada to Argentina, and was also receivable in Europe. Some locations allowed for direct interaction with the 800 participants in Brazil through two-way communication systems. The United States successfully urged Intelsat to donate satellite broadcast time.

Polio Eradication

Dr. Mahler proposed that the Assembly adopt, as a new target for WHO, the eradication of polio by the year 2000. Three of WHO's six regional committees already had adopted such a target. The region of the Americas had set the target date at 1990. The U.S. Delegation cosponsored a resolution to endorse this goal. The U.S. speaker, Dr. Kenneth Bart, Agency Director for Health of U.S. AID, told the Assembly that achievement of the goal would depend on the political will of countries and the investment of adequate human and financial resources. He asked that the Director General seek extrabudgetary resources so that the goal might be achieved. The resolution was approved by consensus.

Tobacco

WHO declared that April 7, 1988, would be the first "World No-Smoking Day," and delegates to the World Health Assembly applauded the global attention that was brought to the issue. A consensus resolution, entitled "Tobacco or Health," asked the Director General to draw up a plan of action addressing targets and intervention plans, possible future no-smoking days, and attention to the special problems of developing countries that depend on tobacco production as a major source of income. Shortly after his election as Director General, Dr. Nakajima told a meeting that "tobacco use is a self-destructive and anti-social habit. Let us rid the world of it."

Chernobyl Follow-up

The Assembly endorsed WHO-developed guidelines for derived intervention levels regarding radionuclides in food and urged member states to utilize them when developing their own national plans for the protection of public health following accidental radioactive contamination of food supplies. WHO action to produce the guidelines was set in motion after the accident at the nuclear power station in Chernobyl, in the Soviet Union.

Pharmaceutical Issues

The 1988 Assembly saw no controversy surrounding the issue of the supply of pharmaceuticals to developing nations. The Assembly adopted four resolutions on related topics, all by consensus. These included the new "Ethical Criteria for Medicinal Drug Promotion." Pharmaceutical industry officials, who had been concerned about the issue prior to the Assembly, told U.S. Delegates they were pleased with the outcome.

Infant Feeding

The Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution prepared by the Executive Board. The text commended governments, women's organizations, professional associations, consumer and other nongovernmental groups, and the food industry for efforts to promote appropriate infant and young child nutrition.

Drug Abuse

The U.S. Delegation took the opportunity of the Assembly to praise the outcome of the June 1987 International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking, and to urge both WHO and national health officials to give increased attention to the recommendations for action developed by that conference.

Epidemiology

The Assembly adopted a resolution emphasizing the essential role of epidemiology in attaining health for all. It encouraged a broad view of epidemiology, encompassing economic, social and cultural factors relevant to health problems.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ISSUES

U.S. Government Payments

At the outset of the World Health Assembly in May 1988, the United States owed WHO $38.1 million in assessments for 1987 and previous years, as well as $74.7 million for 1988. On May 9, during the Assembly, the United States paid $20.5 million against its arrearages. This contribution resulted in full payment of the U.S. assessment for 1987, but left unpaid $17.6 million in arrears from previous years. On November 21, the United States paid WHO $64.6 million against the 1988 assessment, drawing funds from the appropriation for Fiscal Year 1989, which began on October 1. At the end of 1988, the United States owed WHO $27.8 million.

Although the shortfall in contributions from the United States, WHO's major contributor, produced numerous critical comments in the course of the Assembly (mostly from Western nations), the payment in May led WHO officials to speak more optimistically about improvements in the financial situation. WHO issued a press release entitled *Finances of WHO Receive a Welcome Boost: Prospects of an End to Financial Crisis?*

Largely as a result of the U.S. contribution, Director General Mahler said he felt comfortable in recommending to the Assembly a reduction of $25 million in the 1988–1989 regular budget, which had been approved at the 1987 Assembly, as well as the appropriation of an additional $13 million in casual income to help finance the budget. Such a proposal had been offered at the 1987 Assembly, provided that there was a significant improvement in the WHO financial situation.

Following the consensus approval of the revision, the total 1988–1989 effective working budget was established at $608,980,000, and the assessments on member states for 1989 were reduced. The U.S. assessment for 1989 was reduced from $81 million, established in 1987, to $71,187,750, making it lower than the $74.7 million assessment for 1988.

Payment Incentive Plan

Following extended debate, the Assembly adopted a payment incentive plan, which would distribute to member states interest earnings on assessed contributions. The distribution was to be related to the timing of payments by each country. If a country paid early in the calendar year, it would get its full share of interest earnings, according to its assessment rate; if it paid late, it might receive only a small or no share of interest earnings.

The U.S. Delegation opposed the plan, since a hypothetical application of the new system to the 1986–1987 payment situation, as presented by WHO, showed that the United States, which cannot pay earlier than the last quarter of the year due to the existing appropriation schedule, would have had to make nearly $4 million in additional payments annually. The Canadian Delegate strongly argued that such a plan was needed in order to make countries such as the United States pay on time. The plan was approved in committee by a vote of 45 to 19 (U.S.), with 28 abstaining, and in plenary by a vote of 64 to 18 (U.S.), with 29 abstaining. The plan was to be applied at the time of adoption of the budget for the 1992–1993 biennium, with interest earnings to be distributed according to the timing of country payments beginning in 1989.

Budget Reform

The new WHO procedures for development of the regular budget, reported in *United States Participation in the UN, 1987*, pages 206–207, were put into effect in 1988. The Executive Board's Program Committee, meeting October 8 to 14, reviewed the global and interregional portion of the Secretariat's proposed 1990–1991 budget and made recommendations for adjustments in priorities.

It had been the tradition of the governing bodies of WHO to discuss the budget proposals put forward by the secretariat, but not to insist on or make recommendations for change. The U.S. Delegation to the Program Committee insisted that review of the global and interregional portions of the budget, which constitute the sections not directly related to activities in specific countries, provided a direct opportunity for a governing body to address priorities and the relative allocation of resources among programs.

The U.S. Delegation proposed increases in the allocations for emergency preparedness, health care financing, malaria, tuberculosis, tobacco and environmental health, and suggested areas for compensating reductions, particularly in the areas of publications and staff support activities. Other delegations joined in making proposals for specific changes. The proposals were not formally adopted, but Director General Nakajima said he would take into account the recommendations of the Program Committee in putting together his final proposal of the complete 1990–1991 budget.

In order to institutionalize opportunities for governing bodies to participate in decisions on changes in priorities in the program budget, the Program Committee recommended to the Executive Board that each year the Director General should report to the Program Committee on priority activities implemented during the previous year, and on those contemplated for the next year, so that the Committee could make specific recommendations on future program orientations, priorities and allocation of resources. The Committee's report said that "such a dialogue would constitute an important step forward in meeting the wish voiced by members for greater involvement of the Program Committee in the selection of priorities."

Voluntary Contributions

Despite the lateness in payment of U.S. assessed contributions to WHO during 1988, the delegation to the Health Assembly pointed out that U.S. voluntary contributions in the 1986–1987 biennium exceeded those of any other single country. The U.S. voluntary contributions—specifically targeted to high-priority disease prevention and control programs—primarily came from appropriations of U.S. AID and the U.S. Public Health Service. Total voluntary U.S. contributions for the 2-year period were $29.1 million, amounting to 15.07 per cent of all voluntary contributions by national governments. The U.S. contributions were $6.9 million for the Global Program on AIDS, $5.3 million for the Tropical Disease Research program, $5 million for the Onchocerciasis Control Program and $12.5 million for a variety of activities covered by the Voluntary Fund for Health Promotion. In 1988 U.S. voluntary contributions totaled $19,540,345.

Other countries making significant voluntary contributions in the 1986–1987 biennium were Sweden ($25.6 million), Norway ($18.7 million), the Netherlands ($18.6 million), Denmark ($17.3 million), the United Kingdom ($14.7 million), Italy ($13.2 million), Switzerland ($12.4 million), Canada ($10.5 million) and Japan ($8.2 million).

POLITICAL ISSUES

The 1988 Assembly was a relatively noncontentious meeting, continuing a recent trend showing a lessening in efforts to bring into the Assembly political issues that WHO has no capacity to affect. The U.S. Delegation estimated that the political issues were less prominent in part because of the ceremonial nature of the Assembly, marking the 40th anniversary of WHO and the election of a new Director General, in part because of considerable behind-the-scenes efforts by WHO officials to persuade delegates to avoid political activity, and in part because of a slowly evolving recognition by member state delegations that WHO can perform its technical, substantive tasks only if it works by consensus and avoids the damage to its reputation that can result from reports of political conflict in its meetings. Nevertheless, some issues which the U.S. Delegation regarded as improper for WHO were introduced.

Action Regarding Israel

There was no effort to challenge credentials of the Delegation of Israel at the Assembly, nor any effort to deny Israel's vote or impose other sanctions. However, as in many past years, the Assembly adopted a resolution criticizing Israel for its actions in the occupied territories, particularly relating to health. The initial draft of the resolution by Arab state cosponsors was more harsh than the resolutions put forward in previous years, and this had the apparent effect of offending a number of other delegations.

U.S. Delegate Boyer, speaking in committee session, acknowledged that there were concerns about health conditions in the occupied territories that the Assembly might address. However, he regretted the significant amount of time given over to debate on a resolution that contained some of the most excessive and harsh political language ever presented to a World Health Assembly. He urged delegations to signal by their negative votes that they had had enough of this kind of politicization of WHO.

The cosponsors offered to moderate the language at the last minute, but, although the resolution was adopted, the actual vote was more favorable to Israel than votes in previous years. The text was approved in committee by a vote of 62 to 22 (U.S.), with 25 abstaining, and in plenary by a vote of 69 to 23 (U.S.), with 34 abstaining.

Trade Embargoes

Libya and 35 cosponsors introduced at the Assembly a resolution condemning trade embargoes that apply to medical supplies. The Executive Board had discussed the issue of embargoes at its meeting in January 1988 and established a new procedure to deal with the issue. Its decision EB81(3)

> . . . requested the Director General to take the necessary measures to ensure the provision of medical supplies to any member state that has notified him that it is being deprived of such supplies by another member state. If in spite of his efforts, the Director General cannot find a satisfactory solution, he should bring the matter to the attention of the Executive Board and the Health Assembly.

The intention of the Board was that individual member countries should follow this procedure rather than directly bring an embargo issue into the Assembly on their own.

The Swedish Delegation proposed an amendment to the resolution proposed by Libya that would delete all of the operative paragraphs and insert a new one simply confirming the procedure approved by the Board. This amendment was adopted in committee by a vote of 37 (U.S.) to 36, with 11 abstaining, and the full resolution then was approved by a vote of 39 (U.S.) to 29, with 30 abstaining. Observers noted that Libya and the cosponsors were surprised and angered by the vote, which essentially rejected their resolution.

In plenary, Libya introduced a new amendment, "rejecting any embargo on medical supplies for political purposes," but not deleting the paragraph confirming the Board's new procedure. The U.S. Delegation said it opposed the amendment, since any Assembly comment on embargoes was premature and unnecessary until use of the new procedure had been made. The Libyan amendment was approved by a vote of 51 to 14 (U.S.), with 31 abstaining, and the full resolution was then adopted by a vote of 61 to 3 (U.S.), with 21 abstaining. The U.S. Delegation afterward reported that, despite the final vote, the Assembly's confirmation of the new procedures would be useful if the issue should be introduced again in future Assemblies.

In a similar issue, Panama circulated a text complaining that U.S. economic pressures were damaging the health of the Panamanian people by limiting their access to medical supplies. The text was made more moderate through the interventions of other Latin American delegations. The final text, adopted by consensus, "urges all member states to refrain from taking measures which could be detrimental to the health of the population of Panama." The U.S. Delegation said that, although the new procedures on embargoes made this resolution unnecessary, the United States did not call for a vote in view of the long-standing close ties between the people of the United States and the people of Panama and in view of the statement by the Panamanian Delegation that the resolution was not aimed at any particular country.

Assistance to the People of Afghanistan

The Soviet Delegation circulated a resolution calling for increased health assistance to Afghanistan. Western countries and Pakistan were concerned about the language, and insisted that it refer to assistance to "the people of Afghanistan" rather than simply "Afghanistan," so that the resolution did not imply assistance to the Afghan Government. The changes were made, and the resolution was approved by consensus.

Southern Africa

A resolution calling for assistance to front-line states and national liberation movements, basically unchanged from similar resolutions of previous years, was approved. U.S. Delegate Boyer explained the need for the United States to oppose the text because of its excessive political rhetoric in relation to South Africa. He said this was regrettable in view of the warm feelings between the United States and African countries, especially at the Health Assembly, and pointed out that U.S. AID had provided in excess of $100 million in health and population program assistance to Africa from Fiscal Year 1988 funds. However, the resolution remained unchanged, and it was approved in committee by a vote of 99 to 1 (U.S.), with 2 abstaining, and in plenary by a vote of 68 to 1 (U.S.), with 2 abstaining.

Chemical War

As in past years at the Assembly, Iran tried to introduce a new agenda item on chemical war. The U.S. Delegation pointed out to the General Committee that the Executive Board had concluded in January 1988 that, as abhorrent as chemical war is, there was no constructive role for WHO to play on the issue. No member of the committee endorsed Iran's call for a new item, and the issue was dropped.

PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The 33rd meeting of the 38-member Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) Directing Council was held in Washington on September 26–30. WHO Director General Nakajima called for a closer relationship between WHO and PAHO, which serves as WHO's regional office for the Western Hemisphere. Dr. Nakajima and PAHO Director Macedo discussed potential improvements in the relationship, particularly regarding the centralization of fund-raising activities relating to programs to control AIDS. U.S. Delegates privately worked to establish a policy on fund-raising acceptable to both organizations. There were no political confrontations, as is customary in PAHO meetings, in large part due to the concerted effort of the Secretariat to avoid them.

The Council approved the tentative allocations of funds to be provided to PAHO by WHO in its 1990–1991 budget. If approved by the 1989 World Health Assembly, PAHO would receive $65 million. The figure was based on zero real growth and cost increases of 8.1 percent. The U.S. Delegation expressed its approval of the proposal and its hope that other regional committees of WHO would be as frugal as PAHO was in estimating cost increases. The Delegation also noted that consensus approval of this portion of the WHO budget was required by the new budget reform procedure established by WHO's Executive Board in January 1987, and that it had been achieved in this case.

Because of the possibility of a shortfall in the collection of assessments, the PAHO secretariat presented a paper outlining plans for the reduction of expenditures. The U S. Delegation objected to the proposal because it called for a fixed percentage reduction across the board to all programs and did not seek to prioritize program areas and allot funds accordingly. In particular, U.S. Delegates had sought higher priority attention to drug abuse prevention and control of the aedes albopictus mosquito. PAHO Director Macedo rejected the U.S. criticism. Eventually the Council adopted a resolution giving the Director flexibility in determining how cuts were to be applied, but asking for a full report to the Subcommittee on Planning and Programming on the issue. The U.S. Delegation asked the Director to help develop a mechanism for greater involvement of the member states in exercises relating to reassessment of priorities and reallocation of resources.

The U.S. assessment for each year of PAHO's 1988–1989 biennium was $38,162,000. For Fiscal Year 1989, because of a shortfall in the overall appropriation for international organizations, PAHO was allocated a share of $31,609,000, about 83 percent of the assessment. At the time of the Directing Council meeting in September, the United States owed PAHO $19.5 million, equal to about one-half of the U.S. assessment for calendar year 1988. At the end of the year, the U.S. arrearage was $8,964,855.

INTERNATIONAL AGENCY FOR RESEARCH ON CANCER

The 14-member Governing Council of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) met at IARC headquarters in Lyon, France, on April 28–29. Japanese philanthropist Sasakawa, WHO Director General Mahler, WHO Director General-elect Nakajima, the mayor of Lyon and other dignitaries, joined Council members and IARC Director Lorenzo Tomatis in dedicating the new Sasakawa Memorial Hall. This annex to the headquarters was financed entirely by a contribution of 7.3 million French francs from the Japanese Shipbuilding Industry Foundation, led by Mr. Sasakawa.

The Council held an extended discussion of IARC work relating to childhood cancers, passive smoking, nutrition and cancer, tumor growth, chemotherapy-related secondary cancers and AIDS-related studies. The U.S. Delegation requested earlier dissemination of information about IARC's scientific studies so that U.S. and other scientists could follow the progress of the work more closely. Dr. Tomatis said he thought the current system was adequate, but promised to look into the issue further.

The meeting featured strong expressions of concern about IARC's classification of nickel and nickel compounds in a list relating to the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. Council members complained that a footnote to the IARC list, saying the evaluation applied to "the group of chemicals as a whole and not necessarily to all individual chemicals within the group," was ambiguous and implied that restrictive action was needed on some chemicals which by themselves had not been found to be threatening. Dr. Tomatis said that another working group on nickel would be convened in 1989 to address the issue.

In regard to budget priorities, the U.S. Delegate said that a 1987 decision of the Governing Council called upon the Scientific Council to advise the secretariat on priorities in the next biennial budget. The chairman of the Scientific Council said it was virtually impossible to do this, and Dr. Tomatis agreed. However, the U.S. Delegation argued that it was necessary for someone to make judgments on priorities, and it was easier for the Scientific Council to do this than the Governing Council. So that the Governing Council would avoid making uninformed decisions at future sessions, it agreed that the Scientific Council should be expected to do what had been requested.

Dr. Tomatis told the Council that IARC was suffering financial difficulties because of the severe drop in the value of the dollar. The 1988–1989 budget had been adopted at a rate of 6.06 French francs to the dollar, while the average actual rate had been 5.58. Although there were no arrearages of member states (except for $61,388 owed by the United States), the Governing Council's special fund had been depleted, Dr. Tomatis said, and it was likely this would lead to a large increase in assessments for the next biennium, even if the program activity stayed at the same level. The French Delegation urged IARC staff to be more efficient in order to avoid a large increase in assessments, and the U.S. Delegation concurred.

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) consists of 133 full members and one associate member. Since its inception in 1958, the IMO has had its headquarters in London. The main objectives of the IMO are to foster cooperation among governments on technical matters affecting international shipping, to achieve the highest practicable standards of maritime safety at sea, and to protect the marine environment through prevention of pollution of the sea caused by ships and other craft. In recent years, it has cooperated with U.S. initiatives to counter terrorist acts at sea and aboard ships.

The IMO also deals with legal matters concerning international shipping, and with the facilitation of international maritime traffic. It coordinates technical assistance in maritime matters to developing countries and maintains a close relationship with the World Maritime University, in Malmo, Sweden.

ASSEMBLY

The IMO consists of an Assembly, which includes all members and meets every other year (it did not meet in 1988); a Council, with an elected membership of 32; a Maritime Safety Committee (MSC); a Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC); legal; facilitation and technical cooperation committees; and various technical subcommittees. The Council reviews the work of the committees and refers it to the Assembly for final approval. Plenipotentiary conferences, convened when necessary, elaborate and adopt major conventions.

COUNCIL

The 60th and 61st sessions of the Council were held in June and November 1988, respectively. The major issue discussed was the difficult budget situation facing the organization as a result of member governments' nonpayment and/or late payment of assessed contributions. A shortage of funds available to the Council itself forced a cancellation of all subcommittee meetings during 1988. Other IMO committee meetings were reduced in number or duration.

Mr. C. P. Srivastava, the Secretary General, told the Council that he would retire in December 1989. The Council set March 3, 1989, as the deadline for submission of applications for the position of IMO Secretary General.

MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE

The Maritime Safety Committee is the IMO's senior technical committee. It has 10 technical subcommittees. The 55th and 56th sessions of the MSC were held in April 1988 and October 1988, respectively. Progress toward improving safety of life at sea was made with the adoption of two sets of amendments to the 1974 Safety of Life at Sea Convention. Those amendments addressed changes in roll-on/roll-off passenger-ship design and operation, and also instituted specific standards for all types of passenger ships regarding residual stability after damage.

Another initiative was the completion of proposed standards and requirements to implement the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System. These were adopted by an international conference immediately following the 56th MSC Session.

During the 56th session, a review was conducted of the status and adequacy of the IMO measures for the prevention of unlawful acts against passengers and crews onboard ships. In light of terrorist acts against ships or ferries in recent years, the United States initiated the request for this periodic review. The MSC will now have this topic on the agenda at every other meeting.

LEGAL COMMITTEE

A new convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation was completed during a diplomatic conference in Rome in March 1988. The new treaty creates offenses, establishes jurisdiction, and obligates states to prosecute or extradite alleged offenders. A related protocol covers oil rigs and platforms anchored to the continental shelf, and the people on them.

By the end of 1988, 30 countries had signed the new treaty and protocol. The treaty was open for signature to all countries, even those that are not members of the IMO, and was regarded as filling a gap in international law.

The Legal Committee held its 59th session on April 25–29 and its 60th session on October 10–14. The April meeting was an extra session convened in response to a U.K. request, in the aftermath of the 1987 *Herald of Free Enterprise* ferry disaster, for a priority review of the Athens Convention Related to Carriage of Passengers and their Luggage by Sea. A draft Athens Protocol, addressing only the limits of liability and a new rapid-amendment mechanism, was completed at the 60th session. The draft Protocol was to be considered at a diplomatic conference to be scheduled for early 1990.

The Legal Committee also completed its work on the draft IMO Resolution on Cooperation in Maritime Casualty Investigations, proposed jointly by the United States and Liberia. This important maritime-safety initiative was to be submitted to the 1989 Assembly for adoption.

The principal focus of the 60th session was continuing work on the question of liability and compensation related to the maritime carriage of hazardous and noxious substances (HNS). The consensus was that substantial additional study is required before an option is chosen to develop a new international HNS regime. There appeared to be broad interest, however, in developing a scheme that involved sharing the cost of compensation among shipowners and cargo interests. A number of nations, while conceding the wisdom of additional study, urged that the Legal Committee proceed expeditiously in the hope that a new regime could be in place before an HNS catastrophe occurs.

The IMO/UNCTAD Joint Intergovernmental Group of Experts on Maritime Liens and Mortgages, a cooperative effort involving the IMO Legal Committee and the UNCTAD Working group on International Shipping Legislation, held its 4th session in London on May 16–20 and its 5th session in Geneva on December 12–20. A finished draft Convention on Maritime Liens and Mortgages, was expected to be completed at the 6th session in London in September 1989.

During 1988 the Legal Committee also worked on a draft International Convention for Salvage to be presented to a diplomatic conference in April 1989.

MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COMMITTEE

At the 26th session of the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC), held in September a representative from the United States, for the first time, was unanimously elected as Chairman of the MEPC for 1989. Responding to increasing international concern over pollution of the oceans with garbage, the MEPC completed and approved Guidelines for the Implementation of Annex V (Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution by Garbage from Ships) of the 1978 Protocol amending the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973 (MARPOL 73/78).

The Committee unanimously approved the draft revised Annex III (Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution by Harmful Substances Carried by Sea in Packaged Form) of MARPOL 73/78 and draft revisions to the

International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code to implement Annex III.

The Committee also agreed with a U.S. proposal that the guidelines for the carriage of category A, B or C noxious liquids in deep tanks of dry-cargo ships should require that these ships meet the chemical codes as they apply to chemical tankers under regulation 13 of Annex II (Regulations for the Control of Pollution by Noxious Liquid Substances in Bulk).

Acting on the U.S.-prepared draft (which included consideration of policy aspects addressed in the National Research Council Marine Board report entitled *Using Oil Spill Dispersants on the Sea*), the Committee approved a new text for Chapter 7 (Chemical Dispersion) of Section 4 of the IMO *Manual on Oil Pollution*.

With strong support by the United States, the Committee agreed to recommend to the IMO Council that consultative status be granted to the Hazardous Materials Advisory Council.

Concerned with the recent trend in the Committee to have numerous working and drafting groups meet concurrently with Committee sessions in order to accomplish a heavy workload, the U.S. Delegation persuaded the Committee to limit the number of substantive agenda items to a more manageable level.

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)

The Marshall Islands, San Marino and the Federated States of Micronesia became parties to the Convention on International Civil Aviation in 1988, thus increasing the membership of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) to 160 contracting states. On August 1, Dr. Shivinder Singh Sidhu became Secretary General of ICAO. Dr. Sidhu, who had held a number of high-level posts in India, was appointed by the ICAO Council to replace Yves Lambert of France, who had been ICAO Secretary General for 12 years.

SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST CIVIL AVIATION

In accordance with a 1986 ICAO Assembly resolution, ICAO continued in 1988 to give top priority to the security of international civil aviation. The International Conference on Air Law, held at ICAO's headquarters in Montreal on February 9–24, ended with the signing by the United States and 46 other states of a protocol on unlawful acts of violence at international airports. This protocol supplemented the widely accepted 1971 Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation. The protocol extends to unlawful acts of violence at international airports the requirement of the Montreal Convention that the parties to the Convention either extradite the offender to the state where the act was committed, or present the case to their own authorities for the purpose of prosecution.

The protocol was a reaction by the international civil aviation community to terrorist acts at international airports, particularly the attacks in December 1985, in the Rome and Vienna airports. The permanent ICAO Council of 33 states, including the United States, also reacted on March 25 to the total destruction and loss of all on board, by an act of sabotage, of Korean Air flight 858 from Baghdad to Seoul. After considering the case brought before it by the Republic of Korea, the Council vigorously condemned "this despicable act." In a resolution, the Council instructed its Committee on Unlawful Interference to recommend changes in ICAO's security documents and to call upon States to take all appropriate measures to prevent such unlawful acts.

On December 21 a Pan American Airways 747, flight Pan Am 103, was destroyed by a bomb over Lockerbie, Scotland, en route from London to New York, killing 259 persons on board and 11 people on the ground. It was expected that the bombing would be brought to the attention of the ICAO Council by the U.S. and U.K. Governments early in 1989.

The Aviation Security Panel, which reports to the Committee on Unlawful Interference, held its second meeting June 20–30. Those attending included panel members and their advisers from 13 states, plus observers from Interpol, the International Air Transport Association, the Airport Associations Coordinating Council, and the International Federation of Airline Pilots Associations. The Panel completed work on a model national aviation-security program and a model international airport-security program for the new edition of the ICAO Security Manual.

The Panel also reviewed, reorganized and improved ICAO Annex 17, Standards and Recommended Practices for Aviation Security (SARPS). Among the amendments to the Annex recommended by the Panel was a recommended practice, stemming from the sabotage of KAL 858, that in high-threat situations, aircraft operators should check to ensure that disembarking passengers do not leave items on board the aircraft. The Panel also approved a recommended practice against allowing a hijacked aircraft to take off once it has landed in a state's territory.

This matter had been the subject of a policy statement by the Council, following the hijacking of Kuwait Airways flight 422 in April 1988. The Committee on Unlawful Interference later decided to raise this recommended practice to a standard.

ICAO REGIONAL AIR NAVIGATION MEETING

A Limited Africa-Indian Ocean (Communications/Meteorology/Rules of the Air and Air Traffic Services) Regional Air Navigation Meeting was held by ICAO in Lome, Togo, on April 12–27. The purpose of the meeting was to develop a new air-navigation plan based on an assessment of the plan established 9 years earlier at a similar meeting in Arusha, Tanzania, and on new requirements in international civil aviation. Participating in the meeting were 52 contracting states, including the United States which has air services in the region, and nine international organizations.

The meeting led to proposals for the rationalization of the Aeronautical Fixed Telecommunications Network and the direct voice circuits between air traffic service centers. A recommendation was made to improve meteorological networks by the installation of satellite earth stations. Funding problems were raised concerning implementation in the region of ICAO's worldwide plan for transition from the currently used standard instrument landing system to the new microwave landing system. This was one of the topics of particular interest at the meeting. Also considered in detail were various alternatives to obtain technical assistance and financing of the projects included in the air-navigation plan; it was argued that additional funds would speed up the implementation of air-navigation facilities and services and the training of personnel. The United States and the International Air Transport Association presented wording for the meeting's report that clearly specified that funding had to meet cost-effective thresholds based on user requirements.

FUTURE AIR NAVIGATION SYSTEMS

The fourth meeting of the Future Air Navigation Systems (FANS) Committee, which reports directly to the ICAO Council, was held in Montreal on May 2–20. Participating were members from 15 states and four international organizations, plus observers from four states and eight international organizations.

FANS was established by the ICAO Council 5 years earlier to help identify present and future international air-navigation needs over a 25-year period; to identify new concepts and technologies to meet those needs; and to make recommendations regarding the implementation of improvements using those capabilities. The FANS Committee, during its fourth meeting (FANS/4) agreed on a description of the global communications, navigation, and surveillance concept for a 25-year time frame.

In regard to communications systems, the members of FANS/4 unanimously supported the aeronautical satellite architecture recommended by the previous meeting of the Committee. U.S. proposals to maintain flexibility in the provision of satellite services were reflected in the final report. The United States also was successful in promoting its Global Positioning System (GPS) as a future global navigation satellite system. The U.S.S.R. introduced technical details regarding the GLONASS system it was developing, and was cooperative with regard to potential interaction between GPS and GLONASS. The Committee unanimously accepted the automatic dependent surveillance (ADS) concept, and accepted the U.S. proposal to modify the previously selected ADS message format. All the systems addressed in the FANS/4 report are under development and/or implementation in the United States, and conform to U.S. positions.

Follow-on activities in ICAO resulting from the recommendations made by the FANS Committee include (1) development in the Secondary Surveillance Radar Improvements and Collision Avoidance Systems Panel of data-communication standards for aeronautical safety services; (2) development of international standards for aeronautical mobile-satellite services (AMSS) by the AMSS Panel, which commenced its work at a meeting November 7–25; and (3) creation of an ADS Study Group to further develop this concept.

IRAN AIR 655 INCIDENT

The ICAO Council held an extraordinary session on July 13 and 14, requested by the Iranian Government after the shooting down of an Iran Air Airbus A300 on flight Iran Air 655. The plane was accidentally shot down on July 3 by a U.S. naval vessel, the *USS Vincennes*, over the Persian Gulf, while en route from Bandar Abbas, Iran, to Dubai, United Arab Emirates. After expressing profound regret over the loss of 290 lives, and deepest sympathy to the Iranian Government and families of the victims, the Council reaffirmed the fundamental principle that states should refrain from the use of weapons against civil aircraft.

Richard S. Williamson, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, addressed the Council on behalf of the U.S. Government. The Council decision, adopted by consensus, *inter alia*, deplored the use of weapons against a civil aircraft.

The Council also requested states which had not already done so, to ratify, as soon as possible, the addition to Article 3 of the Convention on International Civil Aviation concerning this principle. The ICAO Secretary General was directed to conduct an investigation of the Iran Air incident and report back to the Council during its next session. The President of the Council and the Secretary General were also directed to work with the states concerned to establish proper civil/military coordination and improve routing arrangements for aircraft in the Gulf area, to take all necessary steps to improve ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices to prevent recurrence of such a tragic incident, and to report back to the Council as soon as possible.

On December 5, with Iran in attendance, the Council received the report of the ICAO investigation team. The United States had cooperated extensively with the ICAO investigation by making available to ICAO its own investigatory report, arranging for technical officers of the ICAO investigation team to go on board the *USS Vincennes*, and arranging for the President of the Council and the Secretary General to visit the New Jersey development center for the Aegis combat-information system which was used by the *USS Vincennes*.

On December 7, after extensive discussion, the Council decided not to take final action on the Iran Air 655 incident, but to instruct the ICAO Air Navigation Commission to study the safety recommendations contained in the ICAO investigation report and report back to the next session of the Council in March 1989. This decision of the Council also reiterated the points made in its decision of July 14 and added an expression of appreciation that all parties concerned cooperated fully in the investigation.

FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

The 10th session of the ICAO Facilitation Division, held on September 7–23 at Montreal, was the first session of that Division convened since 1979. The United States attended along with 65 other contracting states, one non-contracting state (the German Democratic Republic), and 10 international organizations. In view of the many developments in international air transport, the meeting found it necessary to make extensive changes to ICAO Annex 9, Standards and Recommended Practices for Facilitation. That Annex deals with entry into and departure from states by civil aircraft, persons and their baggage, and cargo and other articles, as well as the facilities, procedures, and services at international airports, including those for transit and transfer of passengers. Implementation by states of ICAO's facilitation program was also examined.

The U.S. Delegation was successful in achieving its goals on important issues. Insertions were made throughout Annex 9 for attention to be paid to ICAO Annex 17 on aviation security, to the ICAO Security Manual, and to the application of appropriate narcotics-control measures. A large majority of states voted in favor of ICAO producing a guidance manual on narcotics control at international airports. A large majority voted against the ICAO Secretariat's suggestions to amend the proposed UN Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (eventually adopted in December 1988). These proposals would have protected air carriers against detention or seizure of their aircraft if illegal drugs were found on board and would have exempted them from incorrect transport documents or misrepresentation therein. The majority felt these proposals went counter to the general direction on the drug convention.

International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) held the 43rd session of its Administrative Council in Geneva, June 20–July 1. The Council accepted a 1989 budget showing a very slight nominal increase over that of 1988—a consensus decision that the United States supported.

U.S. objectives were also advanced at the three major ITU conferences convened in 1988. The Second Session of the World Administrative Radio Conference on the Geostationary Orbit and Space Services Utilizing It (Space

WARC, August–October, 1988, Geneva) agreed on methods and procedures to allocate arc segments of the geo-stationary orbit among nations for placement of communications satellites, and to accommodate designations of associated frequency spectrum to serve future satellite requirements.

The Ninth Plenary Assembly of the CCITT (International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee) was held in Melbourne, in November, 1988. It adopted nearly 20,000 new and revised international CCITT Recommendations (nonmandatory standards) dealing with the applications and interconnection of the world's telephone, data and information networks. The world conference also made major improvements in the organization and operating methods of CCITT standard-setting procedures; these are expected to result in improved responsiveness to the needs of the world's telecommunications service and equipment providers.

The World Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference (WATTC), held in Melbourne in November-December, was the first such conference convened since 1973. This conference established a revised international regulatory framework for the operation of existing and new telecommunications services, such as facsimile transmission, data transmission, teletext and image transmission. The U.S. objective of preventing the introduction of new barriers to the provision of international telecommunications services was substantially achieved. A minimum of regulation will facilitate access to foreign markets for American firms offering international computer data services, financial and banking services, tourism and other services. Access to these markets can significantly enhance economic and commercial opportunities for U.S. businesses, and increase the value of U.S. service exports.

Additionally, the United States participated in a Regional Administrative Radio Conference (RARC) for the Western Hemisphere, in Rio de Janeiro, in May 1988. The results of this conference, devoted to the allotment of an expanded spectrum band for medium frequency radio broadcasting among nations of this hemisphere, also met U.S. goals of obtaining sufficient spectrum to meet its requirements, and limiting Cuban interference with U.S.-origin broadcasting. In connection with this conference, the ITU held a regional telecommunications trade fair where about a dozen U.S. companies displayed their products and services.

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

The Administrative Council (43rd session) approved the 1989 Union expenditure budget at a level of 106.264 million Swiss francs ($70.843 million at Sfrs. 1.5 = $1.00), representing a fractional increase of less than one percent from the 1988 budget. The net assessment budget (expenditure budget less other income and adjustments) totaled 91.034 million Swiss francs. The U.S. assessed contribution grew from Sfrs. 6.894 million to Sfrs. 6.978 million.

However, because of exchange rate fluctuations, the actual dollar payment fell from $5.176 million for 1988 to $5.057 million for 1989. Corresponding savings were realized by U.S. private sector members, which collectively contribute almost $1.5 million on a voluntary basis to the ITU.

The United States is one of six industrialized countries which are the major contributors to the ITU, all assessed at the same level (7.7 percent of the total regular budget). Increases for staff salaries and related benefits were almost equally offset by a reduction in expenditures for conferences and meetings. However, because of a reduction in the availability of reserve funds that could be transferred to the budget, the level of the contributory unit rose from Sfrs. 229,800 in 1988 to Sfrs. 232,600 for 1989, an increase of 1.74 percent.

The issue of a financing plan to amortize an accumulated and increasing debt in administrative support costs for technical cooperation (described in *United States Participation in the UN*, 1986, pages 238–239) remained unresolved. ITU's external auditor had said in an earlier annual report that the 6.4 million Swiss franc deficit (about $2.5 million) in 1984 had to be absorbed. The 41st Administrative Council (1986) approved an amortization plan providing slightly over 4 million Swiss francs. A plan to amortize an additional 1.880 million Swiss francs, including an outlay from the regular budget, was approved by the 42nd (1987) Council. The 43rd Council similarly endorsed a plan for Sfrs. 4.068 million in deficit reduction.

However, because a shortfall in support costs for technical assistance and cooperation continued to accumulate, a deficit of up to 7.2 million Swiss francs (about $4.8 million) was expected to remain at the end of 1989. The Secretariat asked that the Council members, and their respective governments, consider the eventual implementation of a structural change permitting the full incorporation of this expense into the regular, assessed budget. In the past, the U.S. Government has opposed the absorption of the UNDP-shortfall into the regular budget.

The 1989 Plenipotentiary Conference was expected to reconsider both the appropriate level and financing structures of the ITU's technical cooperation commitments, so that a satisfactory funding arrangement could be agreed to by all members. Concern was expressed that the determination of priority and resource levels for this activity could become a divisive issue between developing and developed countries, in view of efforts by many members to avoid budget growth.

CENTER FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

The Center for Telecommunications Development, created in response to the Report of the Independent Commission for Worldwide Telecommunication Development (1984), became operational in 1987. The Center's original purpose was to stimulate and accelerate the pace of development of telecommunications facilities and services in developing countries by providing advisory services on finance, policy direction and management operations at the pre-commercial or pre-investment stage of project development. However, at its semi-annual meetings in April and October 1988, the Center's Advisory Board acknowledged that the Center's activities had become more focused on projects analogous to those implemented by the Technical Cooperation Department within the ITU's General Secretariat, and consequently raising concerns about duplication of effort. These projects emphasized network design and infrastructure rather than economic or managerial objectives. The Center's mission was to be reviewed at the Plenipotentiary Conference.

The Center initiated action on nearly half of the 57 requests for assistance and services it received in 1988. Consultants were asked to assess needs, develop plans and identify potential funding sources for recommended projects. As a result of these visits, projects were being implemented in Malta, Rwanda, Tanzania, The Gambia, Egypt and Uruguay, among others.

Funding for the Center—in cash and in kind—is provided by voluntary donations from governments, institutions and private industry. The U.S. Department of State made a contribution of $200,000 in 1988, to be divided into three segments: $50,000 for headquarters expenses, $100,000 for field projects, and $50,000 for development of training materials. Several U.S. telecommunications companies, including NYNEX and A. T. & T., contributed about $35,000 to the Center in 1988. During 1988, 16 countries made direct contributions to the Center and another five pledged funds. Despite these contributions, the Center has encountered serious difficulties in attracting an adequate level of voluntary funding. Its fund-raising working group, formed in 1987, is continuing to address this problem.

In view of growing concern about the state of telecommunications development in Third World countries and how the ITU could or should respond, the Secretariat organized a Panel of Experts on this subject, which included a U.S. Representative. The Panel met in October 1987 and April 1988. It produced a report entitled "The Changing Nature of Telecommunications Development," which was reviewed and generally endorsed by the 43rd Administrative Council. Among the report's four major proposals were a call for strengthening the ITU's regional representation in the field, consideration of a merger between the Center for Telecommunications Development and the Technical Cooperation Department, and development of a World Action Plan for telecommunications development. Representatives at the 43rd Administrative Council also expressed concerns about the costs of implementing these proposals. The report was to be considered again at the Plenipotentiary Conference.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE PLANNING

The ITU planned to convene a Plenipotentiary Conference from May 23 to June 30, 1989, in Nice, France. A Plenipotentiary Conference is held once every 6 or 7 years. At these Conferences, the agency has the opportunity to reorganize itself. In addition to budget planning, election of officers and the future program of conferences and activities, this Plenipotentiary was to consider proposals on restructuring of the ITU, and was expected to adopt new basic instruments for the Union.

Barring organizational change, the ITU was expected to elect nine officers at the Conference. Richard E. Butler of Australia, elected in 1982, is the current Secretary General.

The ITU is unusual among international agencies in that it has no permanent constitution. Each Convention is in force only until the next Plenipotentiary Conference, normally held every 7 years. To avoid the time and expense of adopting a basic document at every such Conference, the Nairobi Conference (1982) established a Group of Experts charged with dividing the Nairobi Convention into two documents—a Constitution and a Convention—and with drafting amendment procedures. These documents were presented to the 1988 Administrative Council and will be acted on at the 1989 Plenipotentiary Conference.

ITU TECHNICAL BODIES

International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee

The International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT) held its ninth quadrennial Plenary Assembly in Melbourne, Australia, in November, as well as numerous study group meetings throughout the year. The technical, operational and tariff standards developed and promulgated by the CCITT for international telecommunications carriers, manufacturers, and users are voluntarily implemented worldwide. The Plenary Assembly endorsed new procedures to accelerate the adoption of new standards for telecommunications equipment and networks. Responding to pressure from the U.S. Delegation (both public and private sector representatives), the Plenary Assembly adopted U.S. recommendations to reorganize its component committees on a more functional basis, thereby eliminating redundancies among the groups and reducing the required number of meetings.

The U.S. telecommunications industry, and numerous other U.S. Government departments and agencies, participate actively in CCITT technical meetings and preparatory activities, and contribute to defraying the costs of meetings, in accordance with ITU budget and financial regulations. Private sector organizations directly contribute almost $1.5 million to the ITU, in addition to the Government's assessment of $ 5 million.

The CCITT, with the ITU, in 1988 confronted pressures for a change in the distribution of revenues generated by international telecommunication services between developed and developing countries. While present arrangements call for a 50–50 split of these monies, developing countries were seeking a redistribution tipped in their favor, to provide additional funds for telecommunications development. The ITU Secretariat also continued to study this matter.

Other issues considered within the CCITT included: principles governing the use of private leased lines, the use of personal computers in network operation, the Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN), the convergence of information and telecommunication technologies and an international telecommunication credit card usable worldwide.

International Radio Consultative Committee

The International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) carries out studies and develops international recommendations and specifications in the field of radio communications. Though nonbinding, the recommendations and specifications are generally observed by the telecommunications industry worldwide. Recognized private operating agencies, as well as other scientific and industrial entities of our private sector, participate in the activities of the CCIR and contribute to the cost of meetings. Participation in CCIR activities is carried out primarily through the U.S. National CCIR Organization, a long-standing federal advisory committee to the Department of State with over three hundred members drawn from the private sector and the federal government. Government and industry representatives attend the various CCIR study group meetings in Geneva.

During the past year the CCIR carried out extensive work on High Definition Television (HDTV), as it sought to establish a single global standard for production and program exchange. Experts believed the choice of an HDTV standard would have significant consequences for the world's film and broadcasting industries, as it would determine the ease and practicability of international sale and exchange of these properties.

The CCIR does much of the technical preparations for the World and Regional Administrative Radio Conferences. During 1988, the United States participated in several CCIR Working Parties responsible for technical preparations for the Space WARC meeting.

Under Mr. Kirby's direction, the CCIR also sought to give special emphasis to the needs of developing countries, including extensive studies of radio propagation on the African continent, and the publication of hand-books on computerized spectrum management, antenna design, and other subjects of particular interest for developing countries.

International Frequency Registration Board

The major function of the International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB) is to ensure the orderly recording of radio frequencies and satellite orbital positions which national administrations assign to their radio stations, including satellite systems. The Board also assists countries and administrative radio conferences in all matters related to radio spectrum management.

The IFRB was active in 1988 in dealing with the technical examination, coordination and registration of frequency assignments. Progress also was made in the project on extended use of the ITU computer and implementation of a new computerized system for spectrum management. In the area of support to radio conferences, the Board was active in preparations for the Region 2 Expanded Band MF Broadcasting Conference, held in May in Rio de Janeiro, and in preparations for the fall Space WARC.

Universal Postal Union (UPU)

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Executive Council of the Universal Postal Union met in Bern, Switzerland, from April 18 to May 4. The budget adopted for 1989 called for contributions totaling 22,205,265 Swiss francs from the 169 member countries, slightly less than the 1988 expenditure budget. Although new activities were planned for 1989, they were to be funded by an anticipated 3,532,735 Swiss francs withdrawal from the Reserve Fund. In terms of U.S. contributions, the 1989 assessment of 1,133,500 Swiss francs, approximately 5.11 percent of the total 1989 assessments, was slightly less than in 1988 due to the reduced expenditures related to nonpersonnel operating expenses of the International Bureau of the UPU.

The Council recognized a growing U.S. leadership role in the UPU, notably as the 1989 Congress host and chairman, as prospective Chairman of the Council for the 1989–1994 period following the Congress, and for key work on regulatory issues. An issue of great concern to the Council was the effort to develop a more rational terminal dues structure, the system by which member countries compensate each other for handling each other's mail. Attention was focused also on the rapidly expanding international market in services for the movement of documents and goods as well as on the marketing and technological challenges confronting the UPU.

CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL FOR POSTAL STUDIES

The United States is a member of the Consultative Council for Postal Studies (CCPS), a technical body which conducts postal studies on operational, economic and technical cooperation problems. The studies are aimed at improving the postal services worldwide over the 5-year span between Congresses. In 1988 the most significant studies concluded by the CCPS were on high speed international mail, productivity in postal services, improved standards of international mail circulation, and use of computerized systems in international mail service.

International Labor Organization (ILO)

The International Labor Organization's membership consists of government, worker and employer delegations from 150 member countries. In 1988 the Governing Body of the ILO (28 member states and 14 each worker and employer delegations) met three times, and the annual International Labor Conference was held in June in Geneva.

GOVERNING BODY

Financial Issues

As the executive organ, the Governing Body deals with administrative and program and budget issues. In 1988 the key issues concerned the level of the 1988–1989 program and budget, and measures to be taken regarding projected shortfalls in income, resulting mainly from arrears in U.S. payments. At its February–March meeting, the Governing Body recommended program reductions of $1.9 million in the 1988–1989 budget, and a $5 million reduction in the amount to be added to the Working Capital Fund (WCF) in 1989, to replenish Fund withdrawals made to finance the budget deficit in 1986–1987. The Governing Body also considered the ILO Secretary General's proposal for recalculating the U.S. dollar-Swiss franc exchange rate, and the adoption of an incentive payment plan to spur early payment of members' contributions. The recalculation of the exchange rate, which reduced the value of the U.S. dollar against the Swiss franc, was endorsed by the Governing Body at its May–June session, thus adding approximately $26 million to member assessments in 1989. The Governing Body also considered the ILO Director General's proposal for a long term strategy on the effects of exchange rate fluctuations on the ILO budget, to include a mechanism for the forward purchase of U.S. dollars. The Governing Body agreed to review this proposal at its November session, after receipt of more detailed information from the Director General.

At its June meeting, the ILO Conference adopted, by consensus, the $1.9 million in program cuts and the $5 million reduction in the amount to be added to the Working Capital Fund as recommended by the Governing Body. Also adopted by consensus was the incentive scheme for early payment of member contributions. The Conference adopted by vote the $26 million increase in assessments, resulting from recalculation of the U.S. dollar and Swiss franc exchange rate, and an $8 million replenishment of the Working Capital Fund. The United States voted no on both measures. The combination of the exchange rate adjustment and working capital fund replenishment resulted in increased assessments to member states of approximately $32 million for the 1988–1989 biennium.

At its meeting in November, the Governing Body reached consensus agreement on proposals concerning the use of the premium in the forward purchase proposal, and cuts in the 1988–1989 program budget totaling $12.6

million. The $12.6 million in reduction in the budget was proposed by the ILO Secretariat, to forestall the possibility of income shortfalls due to currency fluctuations, and incomplete payment of contributions. A significant part of the package was the reorganization of various headquarters elements and the abolition of posts. The Governing Body also agreed on a 50 percent split concerning the disposition of the premium earned on the forward purchase mechanism. Under this arrangement, 50 percent of the premium earned would be applied toward member payments qualifying under the incentive scheme (early payments), and 50 percent would be applied to all members regardless of their payment practices.

Budget Reforms

In November 1988 the Governing Body agreed to prioritize programs and adopt program budget reductions totaling some $12.6 million for the 1988–1989 biennium. As noted, a significant part of the reductions involved savings from a reorganization of various headquarters elements, and the abolition of a number of posts. The agreed reductions were consistent with U.S. program priorities.

In 1987 the Governing Body adopted a key budget reform measure to review main program options and resource allocations. This additional consultative step was designed to help the Governing Body reach consensual decisions. As an example, the 1990–1991 program and budget discussion was linked to the ILO's medium term plan in terms of program priorities and resource levels. Governing Body members were in a better position to provide additional program and budgetary guidance. Consistent with U.S. views on reform, the Governing Body in February 1988 noted its support of the Medium Term Plan which included a budget ceiling for the 1990–1991 biennium. The Conference and Governing Body will take final action on the 1990–1991 program budget in 1989.

ILO ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The ILO Annual Conference met in Geneva June 1–22. Almost 1,900 government, worker and employer delegates and advisors from 141 member countries participated. Among the accomplishments of the Conference were the following decisions:

— to initiate a revision of the ILO convention on Indigenous and Tribal Populations;

— to adopt a convention and a recommendation on employment promotion and protection against unemployment;

— to adopt a convention and a recommendation on safety and health in construction; and

— to consider new strategies for rural development, job creation and relief of poverty in the Third World.

U.S. Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin extolled the ILO's role in defense of human rights, and stressed the link between worker rights and sound economic development. Regarding worker rights, Secretary McLaughlin stated that "Our interest is in protecting people, not markets."

President Corazon Aquino of the Philippines and Prime Minister Gonzales of Spain addressed the Conference this year. President Aquino placed protection for human rights as the final duty of government, adding that the next liberation must be economic. Gonzales expressed gratitude to the ILO for its support of human rights in Spain during the Franco years, and stressed the indivisible and interdependent nature of human rights.

Financial Issues

Two issues dominated the Conference's financial agenda: a request to revalue the 1988–1989 budget by $26 million to adjust for the decline in the value of the dollar, and a proposal to recapitalize the Organization's Working Capital Fund by $8 million. The U.S. Delegate argued that since constraints on the federal budget currently limit U.S. ability to pay in full, the United States is not in a position to support measures that would increase assessments. Nonetheless, both the WCF replenishment and the exchange rate adjustment were overwhelmingly approved, both in committee and Conference, over U.S. objections. The final plenary vote to restore the WCF was 360 to 8 (U.S.), with 47 abstentions (mostly Latin Americans). The final vote on the exchange rate adjustment was 301 to 42 (U.S.), with 33 abstentions. Almost all of the no votes came from U.S. and Latin American Government delegates, while most of the abstentions were from the communist countries.

Technical Agenda Items

The heart of the ILO's Annual Conference is its standard-setting activities, including the development of conventions, which, when ratified by governments, are legally binding. The 75th Conference centered upon four technical issues.

Indigenous and Tribal Populations. The primary objective of the revision—scheduled to be completed next year—of ILO Convention No. 107 is to replace the current convention's assimilationist approach with one based on an explicit respect for the cultures, traditions, and unique circumstances of indigenous populations, and to provide them with procedures ensuring at least full consultation on matters directly affecting them. The United States supported this approach. Two key issues were left for next year: whether to refer to indigenous and tribal groups as "peoples" or "populations," and the question of land rights.

Safety and Health in Construction. The convention adopted on this subject, by a vote of 421 (U.S.) to 0, with 1 abstention, applies to all construction activities. The convention was supplemented by a recommendation adopted by a vote of 394 (U.S.) to 0, extending coverage to the construction and erection of oil rigs and offshore installations. The recommendation also calls for safety regulations to protect construction workers engaged in the nuclear power industry.

Employment Promotion and Protection Against Unemployment. The second convention and recommendation adopted by the 1988 Conference seeks to foster coordination between social security systems and employment policy. The U.S. Delegation supported the proposed convention, which provides a sufficient degree of flexibility. The final vote was 367 (U.S.) to 0, with 26 abstentions. The accompanying recommendation deals with occupational or geographical mobility incentives, and benefits due in cases of partial unemployment and part-time work. The recommendation was adopted by a vote of 375 (U.S.) to 0, with 17 abstentions.

Rural Employment Promotion. U.S. objectives were fully achieved in a document which called for broadly based, self-sustaining economic growth, a reduction in agricultural surpluses, and opening of agricultural markets for developing countries. The final committee report recognized the right of property ownership, the right to freely chosen employment, rejected East European amendments calling for government-led development strategies at the national and international levels, and called for positive structural adjustment policies.

Additional Resolutions

The 1988 Conference was more politicized and contentious than in the past few years. The dominating political issue was a highly condemnatory Arab draft resolution against Israel, ostensibly concerning denial of worker rights in the occupied territories. In the face of the sponsors' intransigence and unwillingness to compromise, the Western Group used ILO procedural rules to prevent the Resolutions Committee from completing its work and reporting the resolution out to the plenary session. U.S. and other Western Group members argued that the resolution sought to condemn a member state without due process and introduced political issues that were not within the ILO's competence.

Other Political Issues

The work of the Apartheid Committee centered upon the adoption of an updated Declaration on Action Against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia. While there was much in the updated Declaration that the United States could support, the United States could not support key elements including the call for mandatory sanctions or to break diplomatic relations with South Africa.

As a result, the United States requested a record vote, and along with the Federal Republic of Germany, voted against the revised Declaration in Committee. The U.S. Government Delegate stated that "these measures are unacceptable to the United States both on policy grounds, and because they are outside the ILO's mandate." The plenary subsequently adopted the Committee's report and the updated Declaration by consensus. U.S., Swiss, Italian and Australian employer representatives expressed reservations about sanctions.

The Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations again adopted a comprehensive and balanced report. Four countries (Pakistan, Ecuador, Central African Republic and the Dominican Republic) were mentioned in so-called "special paragraphs" of the Committee's report, which sought to highlight inconsistencies between national law and practice and the requirements of a ratified convention. Additionally, for the third year in a row, the Committee cited Iran for "continued failure to implement" Convention III on employment discrimination—the Committee's harshest form of censure. The Committee also held important discussions on the application of ratified conventions by Czechoslovakia, Poland and Romania, as well as Turkey and the United Kingdom. The Committee, however, did not examine Nicaragua's application of the Freedom of Association conventions, ostensibly because a study mission was scheduled to visit Nicaragua to examine pending cases against that government.

U.S. ACTION ON ILO CONVENTIONS

The United States completed its ratification process in early 1988 of ILO Convention 144, concerning tripartite consultations on ILO matters, and Convention 147, concerning minimum standards on merchant ships. This marked the first time in 35 years that the United States had ratified an ILO convention. Secretary of Labor Ann McLaughlin deposited the instruments of ratification with the Director General of the ILO during a ceremony in Geneva on June 15. The two conventions will come into effect in the United States on June 15, 1989.

Convention 160, concerning sharing of labor statistics, was approved by the Executive Branch, and prepared in late 1988 for transmittal to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations established in March 1951 as a successor to the International Meteorological Organization—a nongovernmental organization founded in 1873. WMO is responsible for promoting international cooperation in the collection, analysis and exchange of meteorological information, and in the application of meteorology to such areas as aviation, shipping, agriculture and water resource management. Through its major programs on weather, climate and water resources, the WMO serves vital U.S. strategic and commercial interests, as well as a wide variety of human needs which depend upon accurate and timely exchange of meteorological information. In 1988 there were 161 members of the WMO, including 156 states and 5 territories.

ORGANIZATION

The supreme body of the WMO is the Congress, which consists of all members of the organization. It meets every 4 years to review WMO program activities, to establish general policies and budgetary requirements for the next 4-year period, and to conduct elections for officers of the organization and members of the Executive Council. The 10th Congress met in 1987. The Executive Council is a subsidiary body of the Congress, and meets at least once a year to supervise the implementation of the programs that the WMO Congress has approved. The Council is composed of 36 directors of national meteorological or hydrometeorological services who serve on the Council in their personal capacity for a 4-year term. It held its 40th session in 1988.

MAJOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

World Weather Watch

The World Weather Watch (WWW) is the basic program of the WMO, facilitating the collection, processing, and free exchange of meteorological data among members. Its essential program elements include the Global Observing System (GOS), the Global Data-Processing System (GDPS), and the Global Telecommunication System (GTS). After lengthy debate, the 40th Executive Council stressed the need to maintain the free and unrestricted exchange of basic data and processed results through the World Weather Watch System. Meteorological information has acquired commercial significance as an input to the operations of firms which market forecasting services. Broad-scale and long-term weather prediction, however, depends crucially on the full, open availability of world-wide data.

World Climate Program

The objective of the World Climate Program (WCP) is to assist members to develop capabilities for monitoring and forecasting climate changes, and, where possible, mitigating their adverse effects. Planning continued for the Second World Climate Conference in 1990 to be held in coordination with the UN Environment Program (UNEP) and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). Participants at this Conference will address a full range of climate issues, with particular emphasis upon the economic benefits of climate applications for developing states.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Completing the process begun at the 10th Congress, the 40th Executive Council passed a resolution establishing the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Its purpose is to carry out internationally-coordinated scientific and impact assessments of the magnitude, timing and potential impact of climate change, and to develop response strategies for mitigating the adverse effects. The Panel is made up of members selected through consultation between the WMO's Secretary General and the Executive Director of the UN Environment Program. At its first meeting in November 1988, the Panel established three working groups and a plan for achieving its objectives. The three working groups will consider the current data available on global climate change, the impact of long-lasting changes in the atmosphere, and possible ways to forestall or reduce such changes—or cope with their consequences. The United States was selected to chair the working group on response strategies which is expected to meet in January 1989. More information on the IPCC is included in the section dealing with the UN Environment Program.

Stratospheric Ozone

The 40th Executive Council requested the WMO Secretary General to conclude an understanding with the UN Environment Program to coordinate the efforts on ozone in the two organizations. WMO will manage the coordination of ozone monitoring, research and scientific assessments, while UNEP will coordinate policy analysis and development. UNEP will also supply the secretariat for the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol, once these agreements are in force.

Hydrology and Water Resources Program

Many regions of the world face serious water problems, ranging from drought to major flood hazards. These problems have reinforced the need for efficient assessment, development and management of water resources. In order to respond to this need, the Hydrology and Water Resources Program (HWR) was established to ensure the assessment and forecasting of the quantity and quality of water resources. The HWR aims to promote worldwide cooperation in the evaluation and development of water resources through the coordinated establishment of hydrological networks and services, including data collection and processing, hydrological forecasting and warning, and the supply of meteorological and hydrological data for planning purposes.

Research and Development

Under the WMO Research and Development Program (RDP), the Organization seeks to promote a better understanding of atmospheric processes. The Commission for Atmospheric Sciences (CAS) has the lead role within WMO for promoting and coordinating members' research efforts. The 40th Executive Council reaffirmed its basic priorities, including forecasting on all scales, tropical meteorology (including tropical cyclones), environmental pollution monitoring, cloud and basic physics, and weather modification research, with special emphasis on medium-scale meteorology.

Technical Cooperation

WMO technical cooperation activities assist member states in the development and maintenance of national meteorological capabilities. The Technical Cooperation Program is financed by the UN Development Program (UNDP), the WMO Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP), trust-funds and the WMO regular budget. The principal source of funds for WMO technical cooperation activities is UNDP, which provides well over half of the total contributions. The large percentage of UNDP-funded projects, however, has generated some financial difficulties for WMO in recent years, as UNDP funding for administrative costs of project implementation have fallen short of WMO requirements due to exchange rate losses. The 40th Executive Council authorized the use of funds from WMO's regular budget to cover shortfalls in the fund, without an additional assessment on member states.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

In January 1988 WMO implemented a proposal by the 10th Congress to change the base budgetary currency unit from the U.S. dollar to the Swiss franc. This slightly reduced the U.S.'s assessed contribution for calendar year 1989.

The Financial Advisory Committee (FAC), first established in 1987, after approval by the 10th Congress, continued to perform a helpful role in 1988. During the 40th Executive Council, the FAC discussed the external auditor's recommendations for improving the efficiency of WMO's operations. After the FAC debated whether to retain the services of the external auditor, the Executive Council decided to renew the auditor's contract for another 4 years after his present term expires in mid-1989.

In implementing its current program and budget, the WMO Secretariat continues to experience serious cash flow difficulties due to late payment of annual assessments. Noting the U.S. example, a growing number of countries have begun to adopt this practice.

VOLUNTARY COOPERATION PROGRAM

The WMO established the Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP) in 1967 at U.S. initiative. The VCP provides equipment and training to developing countries to permit them to participate in the WMO World Weather Watch and other programs. The global participation thus fostered enables all WMO members to gain access to a wide range of meteorological data. Without the VCP, many developing states would be unable to install costly weather monitoring equipment, so that valuable meteorological data (currently used by the United States to support civil aviation, shipping, military activities and storm detection/warning) would be unavailable.

Members may make contributions to the VCP in cash payments to the Voluntary Cooperation Fund or as in-kind assistance in the form of equipment, expert services and fellowships. In 1988 resources from the VCP fund were allocated by the Executive Council for spare parts, experts' travel, fellowships and several high priority programs. In-kind contributions, which represent roughly 95 percent of the overall VCP, totaled approximately $6.9 million in 1988. The United States pledged $1.96 million to the program of which approximately $1.86 million was provided as in-kind assistance in response to specific requests from developing states.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

During 1988 the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) continued to pursue a broad range of activities designed to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy throughout the world, and to provide assurances that nuclear technology and information intended for peaceful use are not diverted to military purposes.

These tasks were accomplished under the overall guidance and direction of the IAEA's 35-member Board of Governors, which met in February, June and September. The General Conference, which is open to participation by all of the 113 IAEA member states, convened in September and provided members an opportunity to discuss issues related to the Agency's work, and to submit recommendations for specific action to the Board of Governors. The General Conference also provided final approval of the IAEA program and budget for 1989.

Implementation of the Agency's activities in its major program areas (safeguards, nuclear safety, technical assistance and research and isotopes) was accomplished by the IAEA Secretariat, located in Vienna, Austria. The Secretariat is composed of approximately 1,750 staff members and is headed by Director General Hans Blix (Sweden).

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Since the beginning of the nuclear era, it has been clear that nuclear materials or technology devoted to peaceful applications could be diverted for use in the development or production of nuclear explosives. It was also widely recognized that the spread of such explosives would threaten the peace and security of all states. Consequently, members of the international community came to realize that the many peaceful benefits of nuclear energy could be made widely available only under certain conditions. In particular, some mechanism was essential to provide assurances that nuclear material and technology intended for peaceful programs would be used exclusively for those purposes.

Prompted by this realization, the United States led the effort to establish the International Atomic Energy Agency in 1957. The Statute of the IAEA clearly reflects the dual role the IAEA must play in the international nuclear community, and specifies that the IAEA should seek to "accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world . . . " and ensure "so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose."

Thus, the IAEA is called on to promote the safe and peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to deter the misuse of nuclear material for nonpeaceful purposes. To assist in the development of nuclear energy, the IAEA provides technical cooperation to many of its developing member states. The IAEA performs its deterrent role through the application of international safeguards.

IAEA PROGRAMS

Safeguards

The safeguards system is a unique system of international verification of national commitments which the IAEA undertakes at the request of member states. On-site inspections by the IAEA include audits of facility records, independent measurements to verify facility records and national reports, and use of instrumental surveillance and seals. The system is not designed to control or regulate national nuclear programs. Rather, its purpose is to deter through threat of timely detection, the diversion of significant quantities of nuclear material from peaceful to nonpeaceful purposes.

During 1988 the IAEA continued to dedicate substantial resources for the application of safeguards on nuclear material and facilities. In view of the vital role of the Agency's safeguards system in providing an international regime for verification of national commitments to the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy, the maintenance of a strong and effective IAEA safeguards program continued to be a matter of highest priority. In his message to the 1988 IAEA General Conference, President Reagan underscored the importance of the IAEA and its safeguards program, noting that the IAEA is "an institution of singular importance to world peace and to the economic and technological advancement of many nations around the globe."

In 1988 the IAEA conducted a total of 2,128 inspections at 513 facilities in 57 member states. The Agency's safeguards responsibilities were carried out with the assistance of over 200 IAEA inspectors utilizing sophisticated equipment for accounting and surveillance. As part of the IAEA's efforts to provide necessary assurances pursuant to its safeguards responsibilities, the Secretariat initiated a review, in collaboration with member states, of the content and format of the IAEA Safeguards Implementation Report (SIR). As a result, a revision of the SIR is expected, in part, to improve public understanding of safeguards effectiveness.

At the June Board of Governors meeting, IAEA Director General Blix highlighted the fact that savings from efficiency gains and budget stringencies are finite, and that there is a need for members to provide an adequate level of resources to prevent any erosion in safeguards effectiveness—a development that neither governments nor the public will accept. In 1988 members continued to consider the question of how to accommodate increasing safeguards obligations within tight budget constraints. In an effort to strengthen the safeguards program, the United States provided over $7.838 million as an in-kind contribution to support the development of improved safeguards techniques and approaches, including more sophisticated surveillance and detection equipment. These funds also supported the provision of 25 cost-free experts to the IAEA safeguards department, as well as activities in support of U.S. non-proliferation objectives.

At its September meeting, the Board of Governors approved an agreement between the IAEA and the People's Republic of China (PRC) in accordance with the latter's voluntary offer to place selected civilian nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. During Board consideration of the agreement, the PRC reiterated its policy to request non-nuclear weapons states to accept safeguards on its nuclear exports, and to provide assurances that it would not use imports of nuclear items for military purposes. The September Board also approved an IAEA-U.S. safeguards agreement covering peaceful nuclear activities in U.S. Protocol I Territories under the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection

Issues related to the safe handling of radiation sources and safe operation of nuclear power plants continued to receive major program emphasis in 1988 as a part of ongoing efforts to improve the IAEA nuclear safety program in the aftermath of the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident. In addition to a full range of activities, including support for Operational Safety Review Teams (OSARTS) and the formulation of basic safety principles for nuclear power plants, the IAEA placed increased emphasis on providing operational safety assistance to members through its Technical Assistance and Cooperation Program.

At the February Board of Governors meeting, Director General Blix underscored the importance of improved nuclear safety measures for enhancing public acceptance of nuclear power. In addition, Dr. Blix called for expansion of the IAEA radiation protection program, "namely, concerning the control, management and disposal of radiotherapy and radiography sources which are causing problems in many developing countries." To promote this objective, the IAEA sponsored an expanded scientific session, encompassing 3 full days of technical discussions, on issues related to nuclear safety and radiation protection at the September 1988 General Conference.

At its June session, the Board of Governors endorsed a revised set of nonbinding nuclear safety codes which are being supplied to member states for their use, where appropriate, as the basis of national regulatory codes. These Nuclear Safety Series (NUSS) guides provide an up-to-date reference on basic safety requirements for the operation of nuclear power plants.

During 1988 the IAEA devoted considerable attention to the development of procedures for implementing the international conventions on notification and assistance in the event of a nuclear accident with potential transboundary radiation releases. These conventions were negotiated under IAEA auspices in 1986 for the purpose of facilitating an international response to future nuclear accidents and radiological emergencies. At the February Board, the IAEA Secretariat provided a demonstration of an early notification system which utilizes existing information linkages that form an integral part of the Global Telecommunications System (GTS), established and maintained by the World Meteorological Organization. Under this system, information regarding a nuclear or radiological emergency is transmitted rapidly on a global scale to enable immediate mobilization of national notification and response networks. In addition, the IAEA has developed and documented, for member states, procedures for implementation of the conventions, contained in the Emergency Notification and Assistance Technical Operations Manual (ENATOM).

Technical Cooperation

The IAEA Technical Assistance and Cooperation program plays an integral role in fulfilling the Agency's responsibility of promoting the safe and peaceful use of atomic energy throughout the world. Under this program, assistance is provided to over 80 developing states to support the provision of experts, training and equipment in a broad range of subject areas including medicine, agriculture, energy development, nuclear safety, hydrology, industry and the physical sciences.

Operational expenses for implementation of technical cooperation activities are funded through voluntary contributions from member states. In addition, the UN Development Program provides support to selected projects administered by the IAEA. In 1988 total contributions from members states to the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund (TACF) exceeded $31.8 million. Of this amount, the United States provided over $8.9 million as a voluntary cash contribution. In addition, the United States supplied a substantial "in-kind" contribution worth $1.5 million to support technical cooperation projects in developing countries which are party either to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) or the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The United States also demonstrated preference to states parties to these Treaties in providing over $3 million worth of training, expert services and fellowships through the IAEA.

Research and Isotopes

The IAEA Department of Research and Isotopes continued to undertake important work related to the peaceful applications of atomic energy, and to the study of nuclear energy in areas related to physical and life sciences. Research activities in nuclear physics, chemistry, hydrology, nuclear medicine and agriculture were performed at laboratories located in Vienna and Seibersdorf (Austria); studies involving radioactivity in the marine environment and related fields were conducted at the IAEA Monaco Laboratory; and, programs designed to support the scientific and technical needs of developing countries were undertaken at the International Centre for Theoretical Physics at Trieste (supported also by the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Italian Government). In 1988 the United States contributed $200,000 to support the construction of expanded and improved training facilities at the Seibersdorf Laboratory, expected to begin in 1989.

Within the IAEA's Department of Research and Isotopes, the Joint FAO/IAEA Division continued to explore ways in which to utilize isotopes and ionizing radiation to benefit member states in such areas as pest control, animal health and nutrition, plant breeding and food preservation. In December 1988 the IAEA joined with the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, and the International Trade Center of UNCTAD/GATT, to sponsor an "International Conference on the Acceptance, Control of and Trade in Irradiated Food," in Geneva. The Conference, which was attended by over 75 nations, endorsed the potential of food irradiation to reduce food-born diseases and post-harvest food losses. At the same time, participants acknowledged the need for proper regulatory control as well as the importance of accurate and scientifically-sound information to enhance public acceptance of food irradiation.

SPECIAL ISSUES

Nuclear Liability

The issue of liability for nuclear accidents—which became a topic of strong interest and concern following the Chernobyl accident—continued to be a matter of high priority. In 1988 the IAEA worked with member states to achieve a harmonization of existing legal instruments pertaining to civil liability, with a view to expanding the scope of application of the existing regime. A special conference was convened in conjunction with the 1988 September General Conference to adopt a joint protocol linking the Paris (OECD) Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy and the Vienna (IAEA) Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage. In addition, the IAEA General Conference requested the Board to convene, in 1989, an open-ended working group to "study all aspects of liability for nuclear damage."

Environmental Issues

Pursuant to the publication of a report (in 1987) by the World Commission on Environment and Development entitled, *Our Common Future*, as well as related work by the UN Environment Program, the 1988 IAEA General Conference decided to request the Director General to prepare a report on the contribution of the IAEA's program activities "towards achieving the objectives of environmentally sound and sustainable development." This report will be reviewed by the Board and will serve as the basis of an IAEA report to the 44th session of the UN General Assembly.

Dumping of Nuclear Wastes

In response to members' concerns, arising largely from the purported dumping of hazardous wastes in African states, the IAEA General Conference requested the Director General to establish a working group with a view to elaborating an internationally agreed code of practice for international transactions involving nuclear wastes. The group is expected to hold its first meeting in May 1989.

Arms Control

In view of his strong personal concern with disarmament as well as the IAEA's experience in administering international safeguards, Director General Blix continued to highlight the potential role of the IAEA in supporting the establishment of an effective arms control verification regime. At the February Board, the Director General specifically mentioned the contribution that the Agency might make to such an effort. In June, at the UN's third special session on disarmament, Dr. Blix detailed the IAEA's work in the application of verification measures through operation of its safeguards system. In January 1988 Dr. Blix sent letters to President Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev. He indicated that the IAEA would be prepared to offer its services if the United States and the Soviet Union considered that IAEA safeguards procedures might be of assistance in the verification of any future agreement.

In response to these initiatives, the United States sought to emphasize the unique and vital character of the IAEA in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and to discourage any direct IAEA involvement in arms control matters. In the U.S. view, such involvement would tend to divert limited IAEA resources from important mandated activities with no commensurate contribution to the bilateral arms control process.

BUDGETARY MATTERS

In 1988 despite careful management of IAEA programs, the IAEA continued to experience resource constraints related to late payment and nonpayment of members' contributions and unfavorable exchange rate fluctuations.

The 1988 budget, approved by the Board and General Conference in 1987, amounted to over $137 million. The budget reflected a real increase of 0.6 percent over 1987 levels for activities conducted as part of the Agency's supplemental nuclear safety program, called for by members following the 1986 Chernobyl accident. Of this amount, the United States contributed $35.16 million from FY'89 appropriations toward its 1988 obligations. The U.S. contribution—approximately 25 percent of the IAEA's total annual resources—was paid in October, after the start of the 1989 fiscal year.

In an effort to alleviate the Agency's cash-flow difficulties, the September Board of Governors approved steps to facilitate the IAEA's financial management procedures, including an increase in the IAEA Working Capital Fund from $2 million to $4 million.

POLITICAL ISSUES

Israeli Nuclear Activities

Israel's 1981 attack on Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor had for a number of years prompted debate and proposals for action against Israel in the IAEA. However, the issue was effectively laid to rest in 1985 by adoption of a resolution that accepted, as sufficient, Israel's assurances that it would not attack or threaten to attack nuclear facilities in Iraq or elsewhere. In accordance with legislative requirements, the Secretary of State certified to Congress in 1988 that Israel continues to exercise full rights and privileges of membership in the IAEA. Although there have been no recent attempts to deny Israel's rights and privileges of membership in the IAEA, Israel remains the subject of controversy at meetings of the General Conference and, less frequently, the Board of Governors.

In 1988 an agenda item entitled, "Israeli Nuclear Capabilities and Threat," was inscribed on the General Conference agenda. The draft resolution which was eventually adopted by the General Conference, 44 to 29 (U.S.) with 11 abstentions, contained familiar criticism of Israel for its purported nuclear weapons activities, but did not recommend any specific action against Israel. Due to an earlier, although unsuccessful, initiative by Egypt related to establishment of a Middle East nuclear weapons free zone, the resolution also incorporated a request for the Director General "to prepare a technical study on different modalities of application of IAEA safeguards in the region, taking into account the Agency's experience in applying its safeguards."

South African Membership

In June 1987 the IAEA Board voted, over U.S. objections, to recommend to the General Conference suspension of South Africa's rights and privileges of membership. While political in nature, African nations sought to link the suspension proposal to South Africa's unsafeguarded nuclear program. In response to this action, the United States strongly and actively opposed efforts to suspend South Africa on the grounds that such a move would violate the principle of universality in international organizations, was illegal under the IAEA Statute, and would undermine attempts to encourage further non-proliferation undertakings by South African authorities.

Action on the suspension proposal was deferred by the 1987 General Conference following indications by South Africa that it would consider adherence to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). In 1988 South Africa engaged in substantive, though inconclusive, dialogue with the United States, Soviet Union and United Kingdom on this matter. Although the General Conference again passed a resolution (58 to 27 (U.S.) with 4 abstentions) "vehemently condemning" South Africa, the Conference deferred action on the proposal to suspend South Africa's IAEA membership until the next session of the General Conference.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In presenting the 1987 IAEA Annual Report to the 43rd session of the UN General Assembly, Director General Blix devoted his remarks to the potentially positive contribution of nuclear power and the Agency's related activities to the management of global environmental problems. In particular, Dr. Blix noted that, "the greenhouse effect of a warming world atmosphere is now seen by scientists and policymakers as a very real threat, and it is becoming more widely realized that, apart from hydropower, nuclear power is the only source that is now available to generate electricity in the quantities, form and reliability needed without producing any of the greenhouse gases." Dr. Blix pointed out that many activities detailed in the IAEA annual report have contributed to the protection or monitoring of the environment. Moreover, Blix cited IAEA activities in nuclear safety and radiation protection, waste management, and safeguards as working effectively to overcome objections to nuclear power, as outlined in the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development.

The United States joined other states in commending the work of the IAEA, and in endorsing the Agency's annual report which was adopted by consensus. U.S. Representative to the IAEA, Ambassador Richard Kennedy, delivered the U.S. statement which underscored the Agency's vital role in supporting the safe and peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and in advancing the broader purposes and principles of the United Nations, namely: the preservation of international peace and security, the development of friendly relations among nations, and the promotion of international cooperation in solving global problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character.

Part 3

Trusteeship and Dependent Areas

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

The Trusteeship Council was set up to oversee the 11 UN Trusteeships under the international trusteeship system established in Chapter XII of the Charter. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) is the sole territory remaining under the system. The Trusteeship Council consists of the five permanent members of the Security Council: China, France, Soviet Union, United Kingdom and the United States, which is the administering authority for TTPI. China has chosen not to participate in the Council's work.

The Trusteeship Council met from May 10 to 27. The 55th session opened with the adoption of the agenda and election of the President (France) and Vice President (United Kingdom). The opening statements of Ambassador Byrne and Department of the Interior Deputy Assistant Secretary Janet J. McCoy emphasized U.S. actions to foster self government in the TTPI and detailed the achievements of Fiscal Year 1987. Palauan Representative Haruo Willter explained the Government of Palau's efforts to ratify the Compact of Free Association and criticized certain nongovernmental organizations' interference in Palau's self-determination process. Three main groups of petitioners appeared: Nongovernmental Organizations, a delegation of elected officials from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Palauans led by Olbiil Era Kelulau (Palau National Congress) and House Speaker Santos Olikong. The United States presented its annual report for the year ending September 30, 1987. By virtue of the new status agreements in effect for the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands in accordance with resolution 2183 of May 28, 1986, the United States, as administering authority, reported only on Palau, the remaining entity of the Trust Territory. The Council reconvened July 19 to adopt its report to the Security Council, including conclusions and recommendations, by a vote of 3 to 1 (U.S.S.R.). At this point the Trusteeship Council concluded its 55th session.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Since 1947 the United States has administered, by trusteeship agreement with the Security Council, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Article 83 of the UN Charter assigned responsibility for strategic trusts to the Security Council, which in turn delegated the routine oversight task to the Trusteeship Council. The United States cooperates fully with and reports annually to the Trusteeship Council.

TTPI originally consisted of more than 2,100 small islands known collectively as Micronesia, with a total land area of about 700 square miles in an area of the Pacific equivalent in size to the continental United States. About 100 of the islands are inhabited, with a total estimated population of about 150,000. Three distinct islands groups originally constituted the Trust Territory: The Marianas (excluding Guam), the Carolines and the Marshalls.

Formerly administered by Japan under a League of Nations mandate, the islands came under U.S. control in World War II. After the founding of the United Nations and its Trusteeship system, the United States and the UN Security Council concluded an agreement on July 18, 1947, creating the TTPI as a strategic trust territory under U.S. administration. From 1951 the U.S. Department of the Interior administered TTPI.

On their own initiative, the peoples of TTPI divided politically into four separate territories. In 1975 the people of the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI) chose to join the United States as a commonwealth and began to function in 1976 as a separate administrative unit with a popularly elected governor and legislature, pending termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. After termination, commonwealth status would give domiciliary inhabitants of the NMI full U.S. citizenship and self-government in accordance with the NMI constitution and as defined in the covenant adopted by the peoples of the islands. In 1978 peoples in the Caroline Islands of Kosrae, Ponape, Truk and Yap voted in a constitutional referendum to establish the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). They formed federal and state governments in 1979. That year, the Marshall Islands also voted to form a constitutional government, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI). The people of Palau in the Carolines formed the Republic of Palau in 1981.

Since 1960 representatives of the islands negotiated with the United States to determine their political status upon termination of the Trusteeship. In contrast to the Northern Mariana islanders, the peoples of the FSM, RMI and Palau chose free association, a relationship defined in Compacts of Free Association. The relationship, terminable by either or both parties, provides for self-government in domestic and foreign affairs and recognizes the Freely Associated States as sovereign. The United States must provide economic assistance for the life of the compacts with the island states and is responsible for their defense and security.

The governments of the FSM and RMI approved the compacts in accordance with their constitutional processes and in UN-observed plebiscites. The U.S. Congress passed the Compact legislation in December 1985 and the President signed it in January 1986.

On May 28, 1986, in resolution 2183 (LIII), the Trusteeship Council determined that the United States had fulfilled its obligations as trustee and asked it to make arrangements for trusteeship termination by September 30, 1986, according to the new status arrangements negotiated with TTPI governments and ratified by their peoples in UN-observed acts of self-determination.

As a result of these arrangements, the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia became sovereign, self-governing states in free association with the United States. A third TTPI entity, the Northern Mariana Islands, became a self-governing U.S. commonwealth.

The Trusteeship agreement, therefore, now only applies to the fourth TTPI entity, the Republic of Palau, whose status is not final. The United States and Palau have negotiated a Compact of Free Association, under which Palau would have a status comparable to that of RMI and FSM. Efforts to bring the Compact into effect have been thwarted thus far by the requirement of a 75 percent approval in the Palauan plebiscite arising from a non-nuclear provision in the Palauan Constitution. On August 29, 1988, the Appellate Division of the Palau Supreme Court declared null and void a referendum of August 4, 1987, amending the Constitution to provide that a simple majority was sufficient to approve the compact, thereby nullifying the plebiscite of August 21 that had approved the compact. In November 1988 Palau elected a new president, Ngiratkel Etpison, following the death of former President Salii. He planned to organize his government before resuming consideration of the Compact.

U.S. TERRITORIES

Special Committee Consideration

The Committee of 24 considered American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands on August 5. As the administrative authority concerned, the United States presented statements to the C-24 on the U.S. small territories and provided information on these territories to the UN Secretariat, in accordance with Article 73(e) of the UN Charter.

American Samoa

American Samoa is an unincorporated and unorganized U.S. territory located 2,300 miles southwest of Hawaii. It comprises seven islands in the South Pacific, and has a total area of 76 square miles and a population of about

best copy available

35,000. The United States acquired six of the islands through agreements with indigenous leaders during the early 1900's and the seventh in 1925.

The C-24 adopted the conclusions and recommendations of its Subcommittee on the Small Territories concerning American Samoa, and decided to submit a draft resolution to the General Assembly. Among other things, the draft reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of American Samoa to self-determination and independence, and called on the United States to take all necessary steps to expedite the process of decolonization in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the Declaration. The resolution also noted the importance of fostering an awareness among the people of American Samoa of the possibilities open to them in exercising their right to self-determination and independence, and called on the United States to strengthen and diversify the economy of the Territory. It also urged the United States to safeguard the right of American Samoans to the natural resources of the territory, including marine resources.

Guam

Guam is an organized, unincorporated U.S. territory. It was ceded to the United States by Spain in 1898 at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War. About 30 miles long and 4 to 8 miles wide, Guam is the southernmost island in the volcanic Mariana Islands chain in the western Pacific, about 6,000 miles west of San Francisco. It has a population of approximately 115,000.

The C-24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution. The resolution, *inter alia*, reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Guam to self-determination and independence and noted the C-24's strong conviction that military bases and installations in Guam could constitute an obstacle to the implementation of the declaration. It urged the United States to continue to take all necessary measures not to involve the territory in offensive acts; to comply fully with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the declaration and the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly relating to military activities. It also urged the United States to strengthen and diversify Guam's economy, especially in the areas of commercial fishing and agriculture and to safeguard the right of the Guamanians to the natural resources of the territory, including its marine resources. The resolution took note that enactment by the U.S. Congress of a Commonwealth Act would confer upon Guam a measure of self government. It also reaffirmed the importance of promoting the Chamorro language and culture.

U.S. Virgin Islands

The U.S. Virgin Islands, also an organized and unincorporated U.S. territory, were purchased from Denmark in 1917. The most prominent of these islands located 1,000 miles southeast of Miami are St. Thomas, St. Croix and St. John.

The population of the territory is about 110,000, and total land area is approximately 130 square miles.

The C-24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution. The draft resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands to self-determination and independence, welcomed the enactment of legislation in March 1988 providing for a referendum in 1989 on options available for the territory's future status, reiterated the responsibility of the United States to create conditions that aid the people of the islands in exercising their rights, and urged the United States to take measures to diversify and expand the territory's infrastructure, and promote economic and social development. The draft also urged the United States to continue to take all necessary measures to comply with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the declaration and General Assembly resolutions that relate to the military activities of administrating powers and their territories.

General Assembly Action

American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands were considered, along with a number of other small territories, during the annual session of the Fourth Committee held during the month of October under the agenda item "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples." On October 20 Ambassador Byrne addressed the Committee, pointing out that the people of American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands have affirmed and reaffirmed in election after election their strong desire to exercise self-determination while maintaining a close relationship with the United States. She called special attention to general elections to be held in November 1988. She said that the United States stands ready to respond to the wishes of the people of all three territories regarding their future political status whenever the people indicate the direction in which they wish to proceed.

On October 25 the Fourth Committee adopted the resolutions on American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands without a vote. The plenary adopted resolutions on Guam (Resolution 43/42), American Samoa (Resolution 43/43) and the U.S. Virgin Islands (Resolution 43/44) without a vote on November 22.

The Fourth Committee decided not to include the resolution on Puerto Rico on its agenda. However, it was mentioned in the C-24 report adopted in the Committee and subsequently in plenary.

NAMIBIA

Security Council Consideration

During 1988 the United States culminated its intensive efforts over a decade to bring independence to Namibia based on UN Security Council resolution 435

(1978). The Security Council met formally only once on the question during the year, on September 29, to mark the 10th anniversary of resolution 435.

On September 29 the Council President issued a statement on the 10th anniversary of adoption of resolution 435, which forms the basis of the Namibia peace settlement. In the statement, members of the Council expressed grave concern that the Namibian people had still not attained self-determination such a long time after approval of the basic resolution. The Council once again called upon South Africa to comply with the relevant resolutions and cease its illegal occupation of the territory. They stressed the Council's continuing commitment to discharge its particular responsibility toward Namibia. The Council members noted the recent developments in the Namibia negotiations and urged the parties to display the political will needed to bring about a final settlement.

In a separate but related development, the Security Council met once, on December 20, to consider a request from Cuba and Angola that the United Nations organize an observer mission to verify the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, as agreed in a bilateral accord between the two countries which was worked out as part of the overall Namibia settlement. The Council unanimously approved the proposal by the Secretary General to establish the UN Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM), once the bilateral agreement and a similar tripartite agreement on Namibia itself were signed. (Resolution 626.)

The lengthy negotiations for the independence of Namibia under resolution 435 came to a successful conclusion with a double signing ceremony December 22 at UN Headquarters in New York. Under the auspices of the UN Secretary General, Cuba and Angola signed a bilateral agreement establishing a schedule for redeployment to the north within Angola and total withdrawal of Cuban troops over 27 months from the start of implementation of resolution 435 in Namibia. The withdrawal would be monitored by a UN observer mission, UNAVEM, approved by the Security Council 2 days earlier in resolution 626.

With Secretary of State George Shultz presiding and in the presence of the Secretary General, South Africa, Cuba and Angola signed a tripartite agreement accepting April 1, 1989, as the date for implementation of resolution 435 and creating a Joint Commission comprised of the three signatories (with the United States and U.S.S.R. as observers) to monitor compliance with the terms of the agreement and the various accords which preceded it.

Speaking at the signing ceremonies, Secretary Shultz called the settlement "a momentous turning point in the history of southern Africa." He noted the "heavy responsibility assumed by the parties to the tripartite agreement and by the international community to see that the commitments undertaken are fully and faithfully implemented." "Nothing else," he added, "will adequately respond to the aspirations of all the peoples of southwestern Africa for a new era of peace and prosperity." He also welcomed the presence at the ceremonies of Soviet representatives, since the Soviet Union had "played an important and constructive role in the peace process." The Secretary reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to do its share to assist the UN in implementation of resolution 435. Noting the holiday season, the Secretary said the governments and individuals responsible for the peace agreements had truly given the world a special gift, "a fresh and very welcome demonstration of the human capacity to put aside the tools of war in favor of the instruments of peace."

The Security Council, which had been kept apprised of the progress of the U.S.-mediated negotiations, in following days considered arrangements for implementation of resolution 435, but was unable to complete its deliberations before the end of the year.

General Assembly Consideration

The General Assembly considered the question of Namibia at seven meetings on November 14–17, with voting on five resolutions taking place the last day. As in the past, the Assembly dealt with the issue in plenary, without prior reference to a main committee. The Assembly had before it: the report of the UN Council for Namibia* (containing the texts of five draft resolutions recommended by that body); the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; the report of the Secretary General; and the Report of the Fourth Committee. A total of 88 national delegations took part in the 3-day debate, as did an observer from the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

All speakers called for Namibian independence in terms of Security Council resolution 435, with the vast majority condemning South Africa for noncompliance with this and other resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Less than one-quarter of all speakers explicitly endorsed SWAPO as the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people." Specific criticism of the United States was infrequent. Over 20 speakers rejected the U.S. position on the linkage between independence for Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, but not all of these mentioned the United States directly. Several speakers again suggested that if the Security Council continued to be unable to secure the independence of Namibia, the General Assembly should find a way to take action in terms of the UN Charter.

---

*The General Assembly established the UN Council for Namibia in 1967 as the only legal authority to administer the territory until independence. The 31 members in 1988 were: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Egypt, Finland, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Turkey, U.S.S.R., Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia. In addition, Brazil, Cuba, Nicaragua, Zimbabwe, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have observer status in the UN Council for Namibia.

Name-calling in Namibia resolutions, which had been a major concern of the U.S. Delegation at the 41st General Assembly in 1986, was finally eliminated in 1987. In 1988 the five Namibia resolutions tabled in 1988 contained no explicit criticism of the United States.

The first resolution, entitled "Situation in Namibia Resulting from the Illegal Occupation of the Territory by South Africa," was adopted by a vote of 130 to 0, with 23 abstentions (U.S.). As in years past, this lengthy resolution (with 68 operative paragraphs) declared that "South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations, its brutal repression of the Namibian people, its acts of destabilization and aggression against independent African states and its policies of apartheid constitute a threat to international peace and security." The resolution reaffirmed that SWAPO is the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people," condemns "linkage" and "constructive engagement" and urged "governments that have in the past used their veto or cast negative votes in the Security Council in regard to the question of the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa to support and respond positively to the international call to isolate racist South Africa." It also strongly condemned "the activities of all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia which are illegally exploiting the resources of the territory." (Resolution 43/26 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)," was adopted by a vote of 140 to 0, with 13 abstentions (U.S.). It reiterated that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) "constitute the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia and demands their immediate and unconditional implementation." The resolution emphasized that the only parties to the dispute are the South African government and SWAPO. It "firmly rejects and condemns the persistent attempt by South Africa to establish a 'linkage' or 'parallelism' between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous or irrelevant issues, in particular the presence of Cuban forces in Angola." (Resolution 43/26 B.)

The third resolution, entitled "Program of Work of the UN Council for Namibia," was adopted by a vote of 147 to 0, with 6 abstentions (U.S.). The resolution approved the report of the UN Council for Namibia, including the recommendations therein, and decided to make "adequate financial provision" for their implementation. It decided that "Namibia, represented by the Council for Namibia, shall participate as a full member in all conferences and meetings organized by the United Nations," and made provision in the program budget of the United Nations for the financing of the SWAPO office in New York "in order to ensure appropriate representation of the people of Namibia at the United Nations" through SWAPO. The resolution also set out several consultative, review and operational tasks for the Council for Namibia to undertake. (Resolution 43/26 C.)

The fourth resolution, entitled "Dissemination of Information and Mobilization of International Public Opinion in Support of the Immediate Independence of Namibia," was adopted by a vote of 128 to 0, with 23 abstentions (U.S.). It outlined a broad program for the UN Council for Namibia, in collaboration with the Department of Public Information of the UN Secretariat and with SWAPO, to "increase the awareness of the international community of the direct responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia and the continued occupation of that territory by the racist regime of South Africa." The resolution allocated $500,000 to the UN Council for Namibia, to be used for a program of cooperation with nongovernmental organizations. It also urged such organizations to "increase the awareness of their national communities and legislative bodies concerning South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia." (Resolution 43/26 D.)

The fifth and last resolution, entitled "UN Fund for Namibia," was adopted by a vote of 148 to 0, with 5 abstentions (U.S.). It stated that the UN Fund for Namibia, including the trust funds for the Nationhood Program and the UN Institute for Namibia (UNIN), should be the primary source of development assistance to Namibians. "As a temporary measure," the resolution again allocated $1.5 million to the UN Fund for Namibia from the UN's 1988 regular budget. It requested the UN Commissioner for Namibia, in consultation with SWAPO, to continue to formulate "assistance projects to the Namibian people to be co-financed by governments and nongovernmental organizations." It expressed appreciation to bodies within the UN system that have contributed to the Nationhood Program for Namibia, and called upon them to continue their participation in the program. It also commended UNIN for "the effectiveness of its training programs for Namibians and its research activities on Namibia." (Resolution 43/26 E.)

In his explanation of vote the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Vernon Walters, reiterated that South Africa had no right to be in Namibia and noted that the lengthy General Assembly debate bore witness to "the international community's firm resolve to end South African administration of Namibia and bring Namibia to independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435." Pointing out that a significant agreement had been reached only days earlier in negotiations in Geneva among the parties to the Namibia conflict, Ambassador Walters added "the calendar for redeployment and withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola . . . is but one of the interlocking elements of an effort which is aimed at fulfilling the objectives" of the UN Charter, and he reemphasized the U.S. commitment to national reconciliation in Angola.

Speaking prior to voting on these resolutions, Ambassador Walters stated that, as had been the practice of the members of the Western Contact Group on the annual series of resolutions on Namibia, the United States would again abstain. He stressed this was not done "out of any indifference to the fate of Namibia or the Namibian people, and far less from any particular affinity for *the positions and policies of the Government of South Africa." Rather, it was a demonstration of U.S. impartiality in the conflict, and our concentration on the search for peace.*

As in years past, the United States took exception to repeated references in the resolutions to SWAPO as the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people," noting that only the free and democratic elections to be held in the territory under the procedures established in resolution 435 would provide the Namibian people the opportunity to choose who they want as their representatives. In response to repeated criticisms of "constructive engagement," Ambassador Walters merely noted that it was as a result of continued U.S. engagement that the Namibian negotiations had reached their promising stage. Finally, the U.S. opposition to comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa was well known to the General Assembly. Ambassador Walters ended with a renewed statement of his government's firm and active commitment to the search for peace in southwestern Africa and the prompt independence of Namibia under Security Council resolution 435.

In a related development, Bernt Carlsson of Sweden, who had assumed office as UN Commissioner for Namibia on July 1, 1987, was killed in the crash of Pan American Flight 103 on December 21, as he flew back to New York to attend the signing ceremony of the tripartite agreement between South Africa, Angola and Cuba which paved the way for implementation of resolution 435.

PUERTO RICO

Cuba, as in recent years, sponsored in the Committee of 24 (C-24 or decolonization special committee) a resolution that "reaffirmed" Puerto Rico's right to independence, an option that Puerto Ricans repeatedly have declined to exercise. This year's resolution of August 16 passed by a vote of 9 to 2, with 11 abstentions and two absent or not voting. The Fourth Committee opted not to refer the resolution to the Plenary, although C-24 results appear in the Fourth Committee report to the UN General Assembly. The Assembly last voted overwhelmingly in 1982 against a move to inscribe Puerto Rico on its agenda.

The United States opposes discussion of Puerto Rico in the C-24 because in 1953, General Assembly resolution 748 removed Puerto Rico from the list of non-self-governing territories, following the decision of the Puerto Rican people that Puerto Rico should become a U.S. Commonwealth. The General Assembly action recognized that Puerto Ricans had exercised their right to self-determination, and that, as a self-governing entity, Puerto Rico was no longer a proper subject for UN consideration under the UN Charter.

WESTERN SAHARA

The conflict in the Western Sahara dates from 1976. When Spain transferred administrative control of the territory to Morocco and Mauritania, the

POLISARIO Front launched a guerrilla war against Mauritania and Morocco to obtain independence for the entire territory. Mauritania withdrew from the territory in 1979. Morocco then extended its territorial claims to include the one-third of the Sahara formerly claimed by Mauritania, and the guerrilla war between the POLISARIO Front and Morocco continued. The United States supports a peaceful settlement acceptable to all parties under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations.

The Security Council on September 20 without debate unanimously approved a resolution (Resolution 621) on the Western Sahara. The resolution, introduced by the Security Council President, took note of the agreement in principle given by Morocco and the POLISARIO Front on August 30 to the joint proposals of the Secretary General and the Chairman of the Organization of African Unity and authorized the Secretary General to appoint a Special Representative for Western Sahara. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to report to the Security Council as soon as possible on the holding of a referendum for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara and on ways to ensure the organization and supervision of the referendum by the United Nations in cooperation with the OAU.

Subsequently, the Secretary General announced the appointment of Hector Gros Espiell of Uruguay as his Special Representative.

At the 43rd General Assembly the Western Sahara issue was raised initially in the Fourth Committee. For the third year in a row, only one resolution was introduced, by Zambia on behalf of Algeria. (Before 1986 both Algeria and Morocco had annually tabled resolutions on Western Sahara.) The draft resolution had 44 other sponsors. Its essential element was again a call for Morocco and the POLISARIO Front, which it described as "the two parties to the conflict," to begin direct negotiations as soon as possible "with a view to bringing about a cease-fire to create the necessary conditions for a peaceful and fair referendum for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara, a referendum without any administrative or military constraints, under the auspices of the Organization of African States and the United Nations."

The draft resolution, which was otherwise identical to the Algerian draft of the previous year, welcomed Security Council resolution 621 of September 20 on the joint UN/OAU negotiations on the territory and the Security Council authorization for the appointment by the Secretary General of a Special Representative for Western Sahara.

The Fourth Committee voted on the Algerian draft resolution on October 18. In explaining the U.S. decision again to abstain, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne noted that progress was being made by the Secretary General in seeking a negotiated settlement and that one party to the dispute viewed the resolution as prejudicial to reaching a settlement. The Algerian draft resolution passed in the Fourth Committee by a vote of 87 to 0, with 53 abstentions (U.S.).

The General Assembly plenary took up the Algerian resolution on November 22, and adopted it by a vote of 86 to 0, with 53 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 43/33.)

NEW CALEDONIA

On November 22 the 43rd General Assembly adopted a consensus resolution (Resolution 43/34) based on compromise language worked out between the French and South Pacific Forum delegations during Special Committee on Decolonization (Committee of 24) deliberations in August. The resolution avoided the criticism of French policy of previous years,

> . . . noted with satisfaction the dialogue initiated under the auspices of the French authorities on the status of the territory, noted further that the French authorities were taking positive measures to promote political, economic and social development in New Caledonia to provide a framework for the peaceful progress of the Territory to self-determination, . . . and urged all the parties involved, in the interest of the people of New Caledonia, to continue their dialogue and to refrain from acts of violence.

The resolution further requested the Committee of 24 to continue examination of the question of New Caledonia at its next session and then to report to the 44th General Assembly. The United States welcomed the achievement of consensus between two important groups of regional allies. South Pacific Forum delegations, including Australia and New Zealand, were generally pleased with the final outcome. France, although it would have preferred the omission of the New Caledonia issue from the 44th UN General Assembly's agenda, accepted the compromise, especially since it resulted in an end to the harsh criticism of French policy which had taken place during the last two Assembly debates.

New Caledonia is a French overseas territory located in the Pacific Ocean and has a population of about 150,000. It was acquired by France in 1853. New Caledonia was inscribed on the original list of non-self-governing territories in 1946 following the transmission by the French Government of information on the territory pursuant to Article 73(e) of the UN Charter. Beginning in 1947, however, France declined to provide further information to the United Nations regarding New Caledonia.

OTHER QUESTIONS

Fourth Committee Resolutions

The Fourth Committee considered its agenda items in one month (September 20–October 25), virtually completing its work on October 25 by taking action on 19 draft resolutions and decisions. The Committee adopted a resolution on reporting information on non-self-governing territories by a vote of 140 to 0, with two abstentions (U.S.). A resolution dealing with the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 118 to 3

(U.S.), with 26 abstentions after an Israeli motion supported by the United States to delete name-calling from the resolution failed to pass. Resolutions and decisions dealing with 12 small territories, including American Samoa, Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as with the UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa, and with offers by member states of study and training facilities for inhabitants of non-self-governing territories, were passed without a vote. The Committee adopted by consensus resolutions and decisions on all of the British territories except St. Helena. After a British motion to defeat a critical reference to military facilities on Ascension Island failed, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 108 to 2 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions.

The Fourth Committee also considered the agenda item titled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration and Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in southern Africa." On October 10 the Fourth Committee adopted a resolution on "foreign economic activities" by a vote of 79 to 9 (U.S.) with 12 abstentions and, concurrently, a decision on "military activities and arrangements by colonial powers in territories" by a vote of 76 to 11 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.

The United States has consistently voted against Fourth Committee resolutions dealing with "foreign economic activities" because these resolutions make outmoded and erroneous assumptions with regard to the activities of multinational corporations. In addition, the U.S. Government does not view the activities of foreign economic entities as significant impediments to self-determination. The United States opposed the decision on military activities because the United States does not view the presence of military facilities and personnel in a non-self-governing territory as necessarily posing a major impediment to the exercise of self-determination by the people there.

Continuing the practice of the past 4 years, the United States was not singled out for condemnation in any of these C-24 drafted resolutions. The Fourth Committee reconvened for 1 day on November 11 to hear petitions relating to the Falklands/Malvinas Islands.

Plenary Action

The resolution on "foreign economic interests" (Resolution 43/29) was approved by a vote of 133 to 9 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions and the declaration on "military activities" by a margin of 128 to 12 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Decision 43/410.) The resolution reporting information from non-self-governing territories was adopted by a vote of 154 to 0 with 2 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 43/28.) The resolution on the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 124 to 4 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. (Resolution 43/30.) The plenary adopted, without a vote, the same 14 draft resolutions and decisions that the Fourth Committee had earlier adopted without a vote. The resolution on St. Helena was passed by a vote of 123 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.), with 20 abstentions. (Decision 43/413.)

On November 22 the plenary adopted the omnibus resolution on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by a vote of 147 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.), with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 43/45.) The United States opposed this resolution because it contained a general condemnation of foreign economic activities and called for the withdrawal of foreign military installations from non-self-governing territories. The plenary also approved on the same date a resolution on the dissemination of information on decolonization by a margin of 149 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.), with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 43/46.) The United States opposed this for budgetary reasons. In addition, the plenary adopted a resolution declaring an International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism by a vote of 135 to 1 (U.S.) and 20 abstentions. The United States opposed the resolution due to the financial implications and because colonialism has already been almost completely eradicated, making unnecessary the resolution's request that the Secretary General prepare an action plan in preparation for a decade of decolonization.

Part 4

Legal Developments

INTRODUCTION

Significant legal issues of both substantive and procedural varieties arise frequently in connection with U.S. participation in UN activities and in activities of international organizations affiliated with the United Nations. Many of these legal matters are discussed in other parts of this report in the context of the underlying issues or particular international organizations to which they relate, including review of the UN Charter; uses of outer space; international human rights; the International Labor Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization and UNESCO matters; UN administration and budget; and UN trusteeship issues. Part 4, therefore, deals separately with 1988 activities of an exclusively legal character, such as those of the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission, the UN Commission on International Trade Law, the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, and special international conferences or committees that consider legal questions involving the drafting of certain treaties or the relations between the United States in its capacity as the host country for UN Headquarters and for missions to the United Nations.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

The General Assembly considers on a biennial basis an item entitled "Measures to Prevent International Terrorism Which Endangers Innocent Human Lives or Jeopardizes Fundamental Freedoms, and Study of the Underlying Cause of those Forms of Terrorism and Acts of Violence Which Lie in Misery, Frustration, Grievance, and Despair Which Cause Some People to Sacrifice Human Lives, Including Their Own, in an Attempt to Effect Radical Change." This item was not on the agenda of the 43rd General Assembly, but will be considered again during the 44th General Assembly.

The General Assembly did, however, adopt without a vote on December 9th resolution 43/167, under the agenda item entitled "Consideration of Measures to Enhance the Protection, Security and Safety of Diplomatic and Consular

Missions and Representatives." This resolution, *inter alia*, called upon all states that had not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the relevant anti-terrorism treaties, which include the convention on the protection of diplomats and the convention against hostage-taking.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The Court's main functions are to decide cases submitted to it by states and to give advisory opinions on legal questions at the request of international organizations authorized to request such opinions pursuant to the Statute of the Court and the UN Charter.

The Court is composed of 15 judges, no 2 of whom may be nationals of the same state. The UN General Assembly and the Security Council, voting independently, elect the judges from a list of persons nominated by national groups in the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The electors are mandated to bear in mind the qualifications of the individual candidates and the need for the Court as a whole to represent the main forms of civilization and the principal legal systems of the world. Court members are elected for 9-year terms, with one third of the total number of judges elected every 3 years. No elections were held in 1988.

The Court submitted to the 43rd General Assembly a brief report on its activities from August 1, 1987, to July 31, 1988. The report contained information on the Court's composition, jurisdiction, judicial work, administration and publications. The General Assembly took note of the report on October 17. (Decision 43/405.)

Nicaragua v. United States of America

The United States continued to maintain that the Court's decision that it had jurisdiction in this case was "clearly and manifestly erroneous as to both fact and law" and that the Court was without jurisdiction to hear the dispute.

On March 29, 1988, the Government of Nicaragua filed a Memorial on the question of damages. The Government of the United States chose not to file a Counter-Memorial within the time limit set by the Court (July 29, 1988).

Case Concerning Elettronica Sicula, S.p.A. (ELSI) United States v. Italy

On February 6, 1987, the United States instituted this contentious proceeding against Italy by filing an Application with the Court seeking resolution of a longstanding commercial dispute. The United States is arguing that Italian authorities took certain actions in the 1960's against a local subsidiary of two U.S. corporations—Raytheon Company and Machlett Laboratories—in violation of the U.S.-Italy 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation (FCN). The United States and Italy have been unable to resolve this dispute through diplomatic channels. The Court, which has jurisdiction over the case under Article 36(1) of its Rules, pursuant to the compromissory clause of the FCN Treaty (Article XXVI), has designated a five Judge Chamber to hear the case. The United States filed a Memorial in the case on May 15, 1987. Italy filed a Counter-Memorial on November 16, 1987. The United States filed a Reply Brief on March 18, 1988, and Italy filed its Rejoinder on July 18, 1988.

INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION

Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 174(II) of November 21, 1947, the International Law Commission (ILC) was established in 1948 to promote the codification and progressive development of international law. The membership, which was increased from 25 to 34 during the 36th General Assembly, consists of legal experts serving in their individual capacities and elected by the General Assembly for 5-year terms. Stephen C. McCaffrey of the United States was elected on November 23, 1981, for a term which began on January 1, 1982, and reelected by the General Assembly on November 14, 1986.

The Commission studies topics it has determined are suitable for codification, or that other UN bodies, usually the General Assembly, refer to it. Its normal procedure is to select one of its members (designated a "special rapporteur") to prepare reports on each of the topics and, after discussion, to draft articles which are acted on by the full Commission. Each year, the Commission reports to the General Assembly on the articles it has adopted during that year's session. It reconsiders the articles in light of government comments, and then adopts final texts which it forwards to the General Assembly. When the Assembly receives a set of draft articles, generally in the form of a proposed convention, it may convene a diplomatic conference to consider adoption of a convention, review the articles itself, note them, or remand them to the Commission for further study.

Work of the Commission's 40th Session

The ILC held its 40th session in Geneva from May 9–July 29. It elected Leonardo Diaz-Gonzalez as its chairman.

The Commission had on its agenda seven substantive topics: state responsibility, jurisdictional immunities of states and their property, status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier, draft code of crimes against the peace and security of mankind, the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses, international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law, relations between states and international organizations (second part of the topic).

The Commission considered all the topics on its agenda except for that dealing with relations between states and international organizations. With respect to the other substantive items it took the following actions:

— The Commission devoted two meetings to the topic of state responsibility. The Special Rapporteur on the topic presented his preliminary report which contained articles dealing with cessation of an international wrongful act of a continuing character and with restitution in kind.

— Jurisdictional immunities of states and their property. The Commission heard a presentation by the Special Rapporteur, which contained an analytical survey of the comments and observations submitted by governments on the draft articles adopted at first reading in 1986. The Special Rapporteur also proposed revised texts for several of the articles.

— Status of the diplomatic courier and bag. The Commission devoted five meetings to consideration of this topic. At the conclusion of its discussions the Commission referred to the drafting committee all the draft articles, including several that had been revised by the Special Rapporteur.

— Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind. In the 13 meetings that the Commission devoted to the topic, it gave particular attention to a draft article entitled "Acts Constituting Crimes against People" and referred it to the drafting committee. In addition, the Commission provisionally adopted six new articles on the topic. Those articles dealt with the obligation to try or extradite, the *non bis idem* principle, nonretroactivity, responsibility of one's superior, the relationship between one's official position and criminal responsibility, and aggression.

— The new Special Rapporteur on international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law proposed 10 draft articles that were based on different premises from the articles on the subject previously considered by the Commission. After a substantial debate the Commission decided to refer the 10 draft articles to the drafting committee and to invite the views of states on the principle issues arising under the new approach.

— The law of the non-navigational issues of international watercourses. The Commission considered four new draft articles dealing with exchange of data and information, pollution of international watercourses, prediction of the environment of international watercourses and pollution on environmental emergencies. The Commission referred those four draft articles to its drafting committee. In addition, it provisionally adopted 14 new articles dealing with the obligation not to cause appreciable harm and a general obligation to cooperate, as well as procedural articles designed to facilitate compliance with those obligations.

General Assembly Action

The Sixth Committee of the 43rd General Assembly considered the Commission's report in October and November. The Sixth Committee approved a resolution on the Commission's report which recommended, *inter alia*, that the Commission should continue its work on all the topics on its agenda and ask the Commission to give special attention to improving its work methods. The Committee approved the draft by consensus and forwarded it to the General Assembly, which adopted it on December 9, also by consensus. (Resolution 43/169.)

UN COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW

The UN Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), established by the General Assembly in 1966, has as two of its principal mandates the progressive codification of international trade law and the coordination of related activities undertaken by other international organizations. The Commission continued at its 21st plenary session and in the meetings of its working groups to conduct its work in a non-politicized and technically oriented manner, without East-West and North-South divisions impairing the effectiveness of its work. The Commission, which works by consensus rather than voting, is composed of 36 member states elected by the General Assembly for a term of 6 years.* Additional states and international organizations participate fully in the work of the Commission as observers.

Entry into Force of UNCITRAL-Prepared Conventions

The United States, China and Italy provided the final three ratifications necessary to bring into force the 1980 UN Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG), prepared by UNCITRAL. This marks the first time the United States has entered into an international treaty on substantive trade law, and culminates more than 3 decades of work begun by other international organizations before the establishment of UNCITRAL. UNCITRAL's progress in this field, and the subsequent entry into force of the

---

*Members in 1988 were Algeria**, Argentina, Australia**, Austria**, Brazil**, Central African Republic**, Chile, China**, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt**, France**, German Democratic Republic**, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan**, Kenya, Lesotho, Libya, Mexico**, Netherlands, Nigeria**, Sierra Leone, Singapore**, Spain, Sweden**, Tanzania**, U.S.S.R.**, United Kingdom**, United States, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

("**") denotes expiration of membership in May 1989. Members are nominated by regional consensus. Permanent Members of the UN Security Council are by tradition reelected upon expiration of their terms.

Convention is in part due to the participation of states representing widely different legal systems on the Commission.

The Commission's 21st Plenary Session

The 21st plenary session of UNCITRAL took place in New York in April 1988. This session, as was a session approximately a decade earlier, was mainly focused on a review of the Commission's general objectives and long-term work program.

In addition to reviewing ongoing projects, subjects for future work were discussed. In discussing work for the next 5–10 years, the topics of legal principles to govern international securities markets and the formation of international commercial contracts by electronic means (on-screen contracting) received wide support, being seen as areas in which national legal systems have not yet established laws or principles of practice. Work planned by the Committee Maritime International (CMI) and other organizations on draft rules on seaway bills and electronic bills of lading made it seem desirable to undertake a general review of transport documents. Also proposed but not accepted were: a model law on promotion and protection of foreign investment, and uniform regulation of liquidated damages and penalty clauses.

The status and promotion of UNCITRAL legal texts already adopted by the Commission was discussed. The Commission noted with satisfaction that the 1980 UN Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods would enter into force for Austria, Finland, Mexico and Sweden on January 1, 1989, and for Australia on April 1, 1989. There was the expectation that within a few years at least 40 or 50 countries would be parties to the Convention. With Mexico's ratification of the UNCITRAL-prepared UN Convention on the Limitation Period for actions arising under the international sale of goods, that Convention was expected to enter into force on August 1, 1988.

UNCITRAL's 1988 Work Program

In 1988 the Commission worked on three ongoing projects, completing one —the UN Convention on International Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, approved by the General Assembly at its 43rd session (A/43/820) and opened for ratification by states.

The second ongoing project, a proposed Convention on Liability of Operators of Transport Terminals, which involves the point at which sea, air and land and inland water means of transport merge in international trade, will be taken up by the Commission at its annual plenary meeting in May 1989. Two working group meetings were held in July and December 1988 on the third project—international rules on electronic funds transfers, which parallels a domestic American law unification project on the same subject.

In addition, the Commission initiated three new projects in 1988—international procurement, international bank guarantees and letters of credit, and countertrade. A working group met on procurement in Vienna in October 1988, and agreed generally on the issues to be covered in a first draft on model procurement rules to be prepared by the Secretariat. This project has focused on both developing country systems and multilateral procurement methods developed by organizations such as GATT, and involves American export-import interests and those of international lending agencies.

The second new topic, international bank guarantees and letters of credit, was the subject of a working group meeting in Vienna in November 1988. On the basis of the meeting, it is expected that the United States will support a new UNCITRAL project, the preparation of a model national law on international letters of credit. The third new project, international countertrade, was reviewed by a group of experts invited by the Secretariat in December 1988, in which the United States participated through the Commerce Department. Further exploratory work is necessary for the United States to determine whether to support continuation of an UNCITRAL project in this area.

Consideration by the Sixth (Legal) Committee

The Sixth Committee of the General Assembly divided its consideration of UNCITRAL's work into two parts. The Committee, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 42/153, met first as a working group to consider the draft Convention on International Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, on which UNCITRAL working groups had met for over a decade. A final draft approved by the Sixth Committee was made possible by compromises reached between U.S. and French positions. The United States, believing that the Convention represented an effective balançing of Anglo-American common law traditions and those of the French-based civil law countries, sought broad application of the Convention's terms, while the French position was to narrow the scope of application of the treaty. The compromises reached allowed the Convention to be approved by the Sixth Committee and go forward to the General Assembly for its consideration, and preserved the consensus method of work traditionally adhered to by UNCITRAL member states.

The Sixth Committee also reviewed the report of the Commission of its work at its 21st session, and particularly noted and approved the training session organized by the Secretariat staff which took place in Lesotho and involved representatives of countries within that region. The training session, the first of what may become several such regional sessions, was designed to promote the use of UNCITRAL-prepared texts and materials on international trade law and practice for countries with limited resources in that area. The United States made a voluntary contribution, through U.S. AID, to a UN Trust Fund established for the purpose of assisting UNCITRAL to further its work in this field.

Action by the General Assembly

The Assembly at its 43rd session noted with approval the report of the Sixth Committee on UNCITRAL's work, and on December 9 adopted the Convention on International Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes without a vote (Resolution 43/165), opening the Convention for ratification by states.

DRAFT CODE OF OFFENSES AGAINST THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF MANKIND

The General Assembly has been considering this item periodically since 1947 without definitive result. The original impetus for the exercise was an inclination, building on the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, to draft highly detailed rules, violation of which would constitute criminal behavior. Initial efforts resulted in a draft by the International Law Commission which did not command sufficient support for final action to be taken. After a hiatus of 20 years, during which the Assembly dealt in other forms with much of the conduct in question, resulting in such instruments as the Genocide Convention and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance With the Charter of the United Nations, the Assembly resumed consideration of this item at its 33rd session in 1978.

In the course of the Assembly's consideration of the item in 1978, and from 1980–1985 and in written comments, the United States along with most of the Western European countries welcomed the decision of the International Law Commission to limit its consideration at this stage to responsibility of individuals rather than states but expressed great doubt that any useful progress could be made, since, *inter alia*, the project exceeded the clear basis of universal agreement and the issues involved are inextricably linked to the mechanism of international criminal jurisdiction on which progress is most unlikely. Western countries also noted the extent to which much of the original material had in fact been dealt with elsewhere in the interim. Support for the item from some non-aligned countries and the Soviet Union has, however, been sufficient to keep it before the United Nations.

The Sixth Committee considered the item at meetings in October and November. On December 9 the General Assembly adopted resolution 43/164 by a vote of 137 to 5 (U.S.) with 13 abstentions which, *inter alia*, invited the International Law Commission to continue its work with a view to elaborating the draft code and decided to include an item in the 44th provisional agenda entitled "Draft Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Mankind." The United States joined France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and the United Kingdom in voting against this resolution on the ground that this item should be considered along with the other work of the International Law Commission.

PROTECTION OF DIPLOMATS

The Sixth Committee considered protection of diplomats at three meetings on October 3–7 and November 14. Norway, on behalf of 19 cosponsors, introduced a draft resolution condemning attacks on diplomats, urging states to take steps to protect the security and safety of diplomats and to report to the Secretary General in accordance with General Assembly resolution 42/154. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to issue a yearly report on the item. The Committee adopted the draft resolution by consensus, and it was adopted by the General Assembly by consensus on December 9. (Resolution 43/167.)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST MERCENARY ACTIVITIES

In resolution 35/48, the General Assembly established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries. The *Ad Hoc* Committee was to be composed of 35 member states but currently consists of 34.* At its first session in 1981, the Committee discussed the various issues that must be resolved before an international convention against mercenary activities can be concluded.

During its 1982 session, the Committee had before it draft conventions prepared by Nigeria and France, comments from several member states, and a compilation of international agreements and national legislation relating to mercenary activities. In addition to discussing the draft articles of the Nigerian and French texts and related proposals from other member states, the Committee formed two working groups that used most of the time allocated to the Committee for its 1982 session. Working Group A dealt with issues of definition and the scope of the future convention, and Working Group B addressed all other issues relevant to it. Both working groups succeeded in clarifying, and thus simplifying, a number of issues, although some critical ones such as the definition of the term "mercenary" were not resolved. This work was continued during the 1983, 1984 and 1985 sessions. No 1986 session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee was held as a result of the UN financial situation. Negotiations resumed in 1987.

The Sixth Committee considered the item in meetings in October and November. On November 23 Nigeria introduced a resolution on behalf of 43 cosponsors renewing the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and inviting it to meet early in 1988 to continue its work. The resolution was approved by the

---

*Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Haiti, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Seychelles, Spain, Suriname, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia.

Sixth Committee without a vote. The Assembly also adopted the resolution on December 9 without a vote. (Resolution 43/168.)

STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

In 1969 the Soviet Union proposed an agenda item for the General Assembly on the "Strengthening of International Security." The Assembly adopted a Soviet-sponsored declaration on this topic in 1970 which touched on the full range of UN activity, including peaceful settlement of disputes, strengthening peacekeeping procedures, disarmament, colonialism, racial discrimination, self-determination and closing the economic gap between developed and developing countries. Resolutions calling for implementation of this declaration have been considered annually by the General Assembly since 1971. Although the United States voted in favor of the initial declaration, it has often abstained or voted against subsequent resolutions under this agenda item on the grounds that they contribute little to promoting peace and respect for the principles of the UN Charter. Moreover, some of these resolutions on strengthening international security have contained formulations unacceptable to the United States.

In recent years the non-aligned countries have used this agenda item as a vehicle to promote cardinal tenets of non-aligned doctrine such as anticolonialism, the New International Economic Order, support for national liberation movements and national sovereignty over natural resources. Six draft resolutions were introduced and considered by the First Committee during the period November 23–30 under the agenda item, "Strengthening International Security" (SIS).

On November 28 Cameroon introduced a new draft resolution under the SIS item, entitled "Strengthening of Regional and International Peace and Security." It noted with satisfaction continuing efforts of the Secretary General to bring about the peaceful solution of regional conflicts and the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to UN Peacekeeping Forces. It urged all states to strengthen cooperation with the Secretary General in the discharge of his functions deriving from the UN Charter and from the mandates and decisions of the Security Council and General Assembly. It also affirmed that adoption and implementation of confidence- and security-building measures, taking into account the Charter and specificity of each particular region, would contribute to the strengthening of regional, as well as international peace and security.

The draft resolution was resubmitted in revised form on November 28 and a further revision was made on November 30. It was approved without a vote by the First Committee the same day. On December 7 the plenary adopted the resolution, also without a vote. (Resolution 43/85.)

On November 25 Yugoslavia submitted its traditional draft resolution entitled "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the

Strengthening of International Security." It was approved by the First Committee on November 30 by a vote of 102 to 1 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. The text reflected non-aligned priorities ranging from implementing the recommendations of the final document of the first special session on disarmament to the linkage of disarmament and development, disengagement of the major powers from areas of conflict and reaffirmation of the legitimacy of armed struggle against "racist and colonial regimes." *Inter alia*, the resolution noted with concern that the provisions of the SIS declaration of 1970 had not been fully implemented and urged all states to abide strictly by their obligations under the UN Charter. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on December 7 by a vote of 131 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions. (Resolution 43/88.)

In earlier years, the United States had abstained on this resolution. At the 43rd Assembly, however, as at the 42nd and 41st, the United States judged that it was compelled to oppose the increasingly objectionable language which has come to dominate the text, and therefore voted against the resolution. Among the extraneous and tendentious formulations in the Yugoslav resolution to which the United States took particular exception were: the implication that the superpowers are primarily responsible for a deteriorating international security climate, the suggestion that the nuclear arms race is being extended into outer space, the linking of disarmament and development, the assertion that the United Nations is an "indispensable forum for negotiations" and the call for unqualified support of national liberation movements.

Malta introduced its traditional SIS resolution in the First Committee on the "Strengthening of Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean Region." The text expressed concern that persistent and increasing tensions in parts of the Mediterranean posed a threat to peace, and reaffirmed that security in the region is closely linked with European security. The resolution emphasized the need to reduce tensions and called for just and viable solutions for existing problems and crises in the region in accordance with the UN Charter and "the withdrawal of foreign forces of occupation and the right of peoples under colonial or foreign domination to self-determination and independence." It also urged all states to cooperate with Mediterranean states to reduce tensions and promote peace, security and cooperation in the region. The resolution also took note of a proposal to establish "a Mediterranean forum as an interdisciplinary framework for the promotion of cooperation in the region," bringing together not only government representatives but also prominent individuals and participants from scientific, educational, cultural and other institutions.

As in previous years, the Mediterranean SIS resolution was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on November 30. The plenary likewise adopted it by consensus on December 7. (Resolution 43/84.)

As it had done once every 3 years from 1981 to 1987, in 1988 Poland took the lead in introducing in the First Committee, on behalf of 19 cosponsors, a resolution entitled, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace." The text recalled the declaration on this subject, which was adopted by the 33rd General Assembly in 1978, and reaffirmed the validity of its principles. It urged all states to continue efforts toward implementation of the declaration at the national and international levels. The resolution also called upon all states to help implement the declaration at the national and international levels and to "strictly adhere" to the principles which it enshrines.

The United States had misgivings about this resolution, especially the underlying thesis that problems of world peace can be solved by passing such hortatory statements or that the declaration, as its text proclaimed, has played an "important role in promoting world peace and international security, common understanding and mutually beneficial cooperation." Accordingly, the United States abstained on the text when it came to a vote. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 30 by a vote of 103 to 0, with 26 (U.S.) abstentions. It was approved by the General Assembly plenary on December 7 by a vote of 128 to 0, with 24 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 43/87.)

Another SIS resolution was introduced by the German Democratic Republic in 1988 after a lapse of 2 years. Entitled "Need For a Result-Oriented Political Dialogue to Improve the International Atmosphere," the draft resolution was introduced on November 23. Welcoming the "favorable trends" in the international environment and conscious of the "urgent need" to reduce armaments and solve such global problems as debt and the environment, it reaffirmed the obligation of states to abide strictly by the UN Charter and called for continuation of the "result-oriented political dialogue" at all levels. It appealed to states to use the United Nations as a forum for dialogue and negotiation on such issues as security, disarmament, implementation of self-determination, eradication of racism and protection of human rights. It appealed to member states to strengthen the role and efficiency of the General Assembly as the "most representative international forum for dialogue and cooperation as well as increasing the political authority of its resolutions adopted without a vote," and recommended the Security Council hold high-level meetings to search for effective ways of improving the international situation and to strengthen its crisis-management capabilities. The last item was deleted from a revised version of the draft tabled November 30. The same day, the draft resolution was approved by the First Committee by a vote of 100 to 1 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. By a margin of 127 to 1 (U.S.) to 24, the plenary adopted the resolution on December 7. (Resolution 43/86.)

The United States had a number of objections to the resolution. Most importantly, it regarded the resolution as an attempt to recirculate "comprehensive security" (see below) formulas which the United States rejected in principle. In addition, references to increasing the authority of General Assembly resolutions were regarded as a back-door means of changing the fact, clearly recorded in the UN Charter, that these resolutions are only recommendations and are in no way binding on member states irrespective of the manner in which they are passed.

The centerpiece of First Committee consideration of the Strengthening of International Security agenda in 1988 was the item entitled "Comprehensive System of International Peace and Security" (CSIS), introduced by the U.S.S.R. and the Eastern European Group. In its 1988 final form, the draft resolution was given the new title of "Comprehensive Approach to Strengthening of International Peace and Security in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations." A follow-up to resolutions entitled "Comprehensive System of International Peace and Security" adopted by the 42nd General Assembly in 1987 and the 41st General Assembly in 1986, the text contained a large amount of hortatory rhetoric about the need to "strengthen further the role and effectiveness of the United Nations on the basis of full and universal implementation of its Charter, in order to ensure international peace and security on a comprehensive basis covering all states and all aspects of their interrelationship." It affirmed that the "system of security embodied in the Charter is the fundamental and irreplaceable mechanism for the preservation or restoration of international peace and security." In its operative portions, the draft called upon member states to

> . . . continue and intensify the international dialogue . . . in order to find universally acceptable ways and means and to coordinate practical measures to strengthen on a comprehensive basis the system of security laid down in the UN Charter and to enhance the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security in all aspects.

It also called upon all states to ensure international security "in all its aspects" in accordance with the UN Charter and the sovereign equality of states.

The text was significantly shorter and less specific than the two previous versions of the resolution. Among other things, it deleted requirements for follow-up action by the Secretary General, and excised specific references to a "comprehensive system of international peace and security," even while keeping the comprehensive security concept intact. In an effort to gain broader support, the sponsors introduced a revised draft resolution on November 28 which removed preambular references to previous CSIS resolutions. On November 30 the First Committee approved the draft by a vote of 83 to 2 (U.S.), with 39 abstentions. On December 7 the plenary approved the resolution by a vote of 97 to 3 (U.S.) to 45.

The General Assembly vote represented an improvement for the sponsors over their 1987 showing, when, by a vote of 76 to 12 (U.S.) with 63 abstentions, less than half of the UN members cast their votes in support of it. However, it still was a lower vote than was registered by the first CSIS resolution in 1986, which passed by a vote of 102 to 2 (U.S.), with 46 abstentions. While the sponsors nominally improved their showing from 1987 to 1988, they did so at the considerable cost of cutting much of the content from the resolution, and by removing references to previous CSIS resolutions. (Resolution 43/89.)

Despite revisions to the text, the United States continued to object to the overall thrust of the CSIS resolution. In a November 28 statement to the First Committee, Ambassador Vernon Walters, the U.S. Permanent Representative, explained the U.S. position on this initiative:

> . . . we believe that the overall concept of a "Comprehensive System of International Peace and Security" as elaborated by its sponsors in speeches, articles and other documents poses a serious threat to the United Nations and to the security of its member states.

He explained that the past year had shown that the already existing UN system had shown it was capable of helping resolve such major conflicts as those in the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan and Southern Africa. He warned that, despite Soviet willingness to tamper with individual phrases, the whole CSIS agenda remained in the background like a "Trojan Horse" ready to reveal itself in all its force if allowed through the door. He recalled that an *aide memoire* circulated by the U.S.S.R. earlier in the session on the same subject referred to a 1987 article by Soviet leader Gorbachev which contained numerous proposals, many of them "grandiose, unworkable and rejected" when they were first brought forward in earlier decades. He noted that much work had already been done in the United Nations to streamline the functioning of the organization and invited the Soviets to focus their efforts along lines which were already being pursued. Warning that the "comprehensive security" approach was little more than an ingenious mechanism to control the UN agenda by defining any item at will as security-related, he suggested that a more practical approach in this age of pragmatism was to try to find sensible solutions for specific problems rather than attempt to impose a new "comprehensive security" ideology on the organization.

In an explanation of vote offered on November 30, Ambassador Herbert Okun, again rejecting the Soviet concept of "comprehensive security," stated the following:

> . . . the United States is prepared to engage in a wide-ranging dialogue with other members of this organization in a consideration of ways to improve operations under the Charter. We are, in fact, engaged in such an exercise at this very moment, in appropriate committees. When sponsors of the resolution under consideration choose to submit their concrete ideas to the relevant bodies of the United Nations for study, they will find the United States a ready and willing partner in conducting the serious business of this organization.

GOOD-NEIGHBORLINESS BETWEEN STATES

The Sixth Committee convened the Sub-Committee on Good-Neighborliness, established during the 40th General Assembly, which held eight meetings on the item "Development and Strengthening of Good-Neighborliness Between States" on October 5, 13, 21, 26 and November 1, 9, 14, 16. The Sub-Committee discussed the listing of elements of good-neighborliness.

The Sixth Committee considered the item during five meetings held November 17, 18, 25 and 29. The Committee had before it two draft resolutions, entitled "Development and strengthening of good-neighborliness between States." The first draft resolution (A/C.6/43/L.14 Rev. 1), was introduced by the United Kingdom on behalf of 10 Western countries. This resolution took note of the report of the Sub-Committee and decided to include the item on the agenda of the 45th General Assembly. The second resolution (A/C.6/43/L.20), introduced by Romania on behalf of 39 countries, also directed that work on the list of elements of good-neighborliness be completed and the Sub-Committee begin elaboration of a suitable international document on the topic. Attempts to negotiate a single resolution failed.

On November 29 the Committee voted on the drafts in the order in which they were submitted. The draft introduced by the United Kingdom was adopted by a vote of 28 (U.S.) to 20 with 64 abstentions. The draft introduced by Romania was adopted by a vote of 100 to 9 (U.S.) with 18 abstentions. In its explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Robert Rosenstock, said that the United States would vote in favor of the British draft even though the United States had grave reservations about the appropriateness of the subject in the Sixth Committee from the beginning. Although the United States had kept an open mind, after several years of study it had become clear that there was no legal content to the item. That inescapable conclusion, together with the equivocal position of the primary proponent of the item, which had been mistreating ethnic groups in its own country to an astonishing extent during the past 6 months, led the U.S. Delegation to vote in favor of the British resolution and against the Romanian resolution.

The General Assembly adopted both resolutions on December 9, 1989. The British draft was adopted by a vote of 67 (U.S.) to 9 with 65 abstentions and the Romanian draft was adopted by a vote of 124 to 8 (U.S.) with 22 abstentions. (Resolution 43/171 A and B.)

HOST COUNTRY RELATIONS

The General Assembly established the Committee on Relations with the Host Country* in 1971 to replace the informal Joint Committee on Host Country Relations. The Committee deals with the security of UN missions and safety of personnel, diplomatic privileges and immunities, tax problems, financial indebtedness of UN missions and their personnel, visa matters and other issues relating to the implementation of the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the United States.**

---

*The Committee's membership for 1988 was as follows: Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, France, Honduras, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Senegal, Spain, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom and United States.

**Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations. (Resolution 169(II), October 31, 1947, 61 Stat. 3416.)

The Committee met six times during 1988: May 5, June 24, September 23, October 12, November 16 and November 23.

On December 9 the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 43/172, which approved the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. The resolution endorsed the recommendations of the Committee contained in its report, reaffirmed its condemnation of criminal acts violating the security of missions accredited to the United Nations and the safety of their personnel and urged the host country (U.S.) to take all necessary measures to prevent such acts. The resolution also reiterated

> . . . its request to the parties concerned to follow consultations with a view to reaching solutions to the issues raised by certain member states concerning the size of their missions, in accordance with the agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations and in the spirit of cooperation;

and urged

> . . . the host country, in the light of the consideration by the Committee on Relations with the Host Country of travel regulations issued by the host country, to continue to honor its obligations to facilitate the functioning of the United Nations and the missions accredited to it . . .

On May 5 the Committee considered the question of security of missions and the safety of their personnel. Specific examples were raised by the Soviet Union and Bulgaria concerning the gathering of demonstrators in the vicinity of mission premises. The U.S. Representative, Hugh Montgomery, emphasized that the United States takes such incidents seriously and maintains close liaison with law enforcement authorities in order to secure the safety of Missions to the United Nations. He further emphasized, however, that in the United States, the interest of controlling public demonstrations must always be balanced against the right of the people freely to assemble and express their views. As a result, it was impossible to provide absolute insulation from demonstrations. The United States wished to be immediately informed, however, if such demonstrations reached the point of impeding the functions of the missions.

On May 5 the Representative of the United States drew to the attention of the Committee the amendment of the Foreign Missions Act, entitled "Limitations on the Use of a Foreign Mission in a Manner Incompatible With its Status as a Foreign Mission" (P.L. 100-204, Sec 128). It was emphasized that this amendment reflected long-established U.S. policy prohibiting the use of inviolable premises of a foreign mission for purposes not consonant with the foreign mission purpose underlying the inviolability. Missions were urged to consult directly with the U.S. Mission for clarification regarding the application of this amendment to particular circumstances.

On May 5, June 24 and October 12, the Committee directed its attention to the expansion of restrictions on private and recreational travel imposed by the host country (during 1988, controls were imposed on the members of the UN missions of the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Hungary as well as their nationals employed by the UN Secretariat, pursuant to Section 216 of the Foreign Missions Act). The member countries affected by these new controls as well as those upon which such controls had been previously imposed protested these measures as "unlawful and discriminatory." The Representative of the United States repeatedly responded that these measures were grounded in the right of the host country to protect its national security and, as they addressed only private and recreational travel, did not encroach on the ability of those concerned to perform their functions in regard to the United Nations. The U.S. Representative emphasized the host country's continued respect for Article 105 of the UN Charter which provides that the representatives of members shall enjoy such privileges and immunities "as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization."

On May 5 and September 23, the Committee considered the complaints of Libya and Nicaragua, respectively, regarding issuance of entry visas by the host country. It was asserted that the host country had interfered with the right of access to the United Nations of representatives of these member states by not promptly issuing visas. The Representative of the United States firmly denied this charge and explained that the concerned member states involved are required to apply for visas reasonably in advance (15 working days) and they have repeatedly been advised of this requirement. Even when such countries defy this requirement and apply for visas at the last moment, the United States makes every effort to expedite the issuance process. For example, in the instance complained of, Nicaragua had made last minute application for 67 visas (in connection with President Ortega's visit to the General Assembly) and, prior to the time of the cancellation of Ortega's visit, 30 visas had been authorized and delivered and the remainder were in advanced stages of consideration.

On May 5 and October 12 the Committee considered the concerns of member states that immigration and customs formalities be expedited at John F. Kennedy International Airport. The establishment of special entry lines was commended but there was concern expressed over the substantial delays still being experienced at this facility. The Representative of the United States assured the delegates of the host country's efforts to reduce these problems but explained that increased security measures at this airport, as well as at most other major airports around the world, are making it much more difficult to avoid delays.

Parking Problem

On May 5 representatives of Ivory Coast and Rwanda complained about the lack of parking spaces for their Missions and the number of summons issued for illegal parking. The U.S. Representative reminded the Committee that each mission was allocated two parking spaces by the City of New York traffic authorities. The New York City Commissioner to the United Nations and the Consular Corps sympathized with the parking problems encountered by the Missions. The Commissioner said she was having discussions on their behalf with the appropriate authorities and invited them to come to her office for further assistance.

ICJ Advisory Opinion on the PLO Observer Mission in New York

On May 5 the PLO Observer expressed the opinion that the General Assembly should take note of the April 26 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the arbitration of the dispute between the United Nations and the United States regarding the Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations. His suggestion was supported by representatives of the Soviet Union, Iraq, Bulgaria and the United Kingdom.

Denial of Visa to Arafat

On November 28 the Committee met in an emergency session to consider the denial by the United States of a visa to PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat who intended to participate in the General Assembly debate on Palestine. Statements opposing the U.S. action were made by representatives of a number of governments. A statement was made by the UN Legal Counsel explaining why in his view the United States was obliged to issue a visa to Mr. Arafat. The U.S. Representative, Patricia M. Byrne, explained that the United States had convincing evidence that the PLO had engaged in terrorism against Americans and others. She maintained that the decision was consistent with the U.S. security reservation to the Headquarters Agreement and the right to exclude individuals responsible for terrorism. The Chairman of the Committee, in a closing statement, set forth the following as the conclusions of the Committee: (1) the majority of the Committee believed the denial of the visa was a violation of U.S. obligations under the Headquarters Agreement; (2) the United States had restated its position that its actions complied fully with its obligations under the Headquarters Agreement; and (3) the majority of those who spoke urged the United States to reconsider its decision in order to enable Mr. Arafat to participate in the General Assembly.

PROTECTION OF PERSONS UNDER DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT

On December 15, 1980, the General Assembly adopted resolution 35/177 in which it referred to the Sixth Committee the task of elaborating a draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment. Pursuant to the same resolution, an open-ended working group was established for that purpose.

During the 36th, 37th and 38th sessions, Mr. Luigi Ferrari Bravo of Italy chaired the working group, while Mr. Tullio Treves of Italy assumed chairmanship of the working group from the 39th through 43rd sessions. At the end of its 43rd session, the working group transmitted to the Sixth Committee a completed text of the Body of Principles. On December 9 the General Assembly approved the Body of Principles in resolution 43/173, adopted without a vote.

The Body of Principles, as its title indicates, applies to all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment. In addition to a short definitional section, the Body of Principles contains 39 principles setting forth many of the concepts of due process and protection from cruel and unusual punishment contained in the U.S. Constitution. The Body of Principles also contains a savings clause, under which none of its provisions may be interpreted to undermine applicable protections accorded under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The United States welcomed the completion of the Body of Principles and readily joined consensus on resolution 43/173. The U.S. Representative expressed the hope that the Body of Principles will serve as a model in protecting the human rights of prisoners and detainees throughout the world.

DEVELOPMENT OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

The Sixth Committee of the 43rd General Assembly considered the item "Progressive Development of the Principles and Norms of International Law Relating to the New International Economic Order" (NIEO) at three meetings on November 14, 15 and 22. On November 22, the Philippines, on behalf of 21 other cosponsors, introduced a draft resolution recommending

> . . . that the Sixth Committee should consider making a final decision at the 44th session of the General Assembly on the question of the appropriate forum within its framework which would undertake the task of completing the elaboration of the process of codification and progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order, taking into account the proposals and suggestions which have been or will be submitted by member states on the matter.

This resolution was approved by the Committee by a vote of 81 to 0, with 23 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States, in its explanation of vote, stated that it believed that there was insufficient agreement on the principles set out in earlier resolutions on the NIEO to elaborate principles of law relating to the NIEO and that it was even less opportune to decide on a forum in which to pursue such work.

The General Assembly adopted the resolution (Resolution 43/163) on December 9 by a vote of 132 to 0, with 22 (U.S.) abstentions.

Part 5

Budget, Administration and Institutional Management

INTRODUCTION

Implementation of reform was the centerpiece of U.S. efforts in 1988 in the areas of UN budget, administration and institutional management. Significant progress achieved in these efforts, as well as breakthroughs in establishing important new UN peacekeeping activities, were reflected in a determination (required by law—see below) issued by the President on September 13, which allowed the release of funds appropriated for U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations. In making this determination, the President also indicated his intention to seek essentially full funding for the organizations of the UN system in the following year and directed the Department of State to prepare a plan for paying outstanding arrearages in U.S. assessed contributions to the organizations of the UN system. Separately, determinations also were made to release funds appropriated for U.S. assessed contributions to the WHO, ILO, WMO, ICAO and UNIDO. Funds appropriated for the FAO were not of an amount large enough to require Presidential determinations for their release.

Administration efforts for implementation of reform were conducted in the shadow of specific Congressional requirements for reform. As explained in last year's report, the original Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment (Section 143 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, P.L. 99-93) was revised with enactment in December 1987 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Section 702, P.L. 100-204). The modified amendment required Presidential determinations regarding the achievement of specific reform measures (consensus-based budget process, progress toward limitations on secondments by any single member state to the UN Secretariat, and implementation of a 15 percent reduction in UN Secretariat staff) for the full release of funds appropriated for U.S. calendar year 1987 (fiscal year 1988) and calendar year 1988 (fiscal year 1989) assessed contributions to the United Nations. The requirements for Presidential determinations for release of funds appropriated for assessed contributions to the specialized agencies were not as stringent.

Against the backdrop of shortfalls of over $80 million in funds appropriated for U.S. assessed contributions to the organizations of the UN system in 1987 (fiscal year 1988), far greater shortfalls—over $140 million—were indicated in the President's FY 89 budget request (issued in February 1989) for U.S. assessed contributions in 1988. This unprecedented shortfall of such a magnitude in the President's request was mandated by the Budget Summit Compromise of November 1987, which limited the FY 89 budget to 2 percent over FY 88.

The work of the General Assembly's Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) is related to the work of all other main UN committees. It deals with organization-wide administrative problems, such as conference scheduling, personnel issues and the coordination of activities among various UN organizations. Before the General Assembly votes on any resolution having financial implications, the Fifth Committee must provide information on how the resolution, if adopted, will affect the UN budget. In its most important role, the Fifth Committee makes recommendations to the General Assembly on the regular program budget and on assessed peacekeeping budgets.

Several special UN bodies—some consisting of experts serving in their personal capacities and some of an intergovernmental nature—assist in this work. In financial matters, the best known of the expert committees are the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Committee on Contributions. The ACABQ examines the Secretary General's proposals and reports to the General Assembly on the UN budget and UN accounts, on the administrative budgets of the UN specialized agencies and on other administrative, financial and budgetary matters referred to it. The Committee on Contributions advises the General Assembly on all questions relating to the apportionment of UN expenses among UN members. Other expert financial bodies are the Board of Auditors, the Investment Committee (which advises on the management of the Pension Fund) and the UN Joint Staff Pension Board.

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), composed of experts in the personnel field, makes recommendations to the General Assembly for the regulation and coordination of conditions of service within the United Nations, the specialized agencies and other international organizations that participate in the UN common system of salaries, allowances and other benefits. The Committee on Conferences is an intergovernmental, administrative body, which seeks to develop a workable calendar of UN meetings and advises the Assembly on the most efficient use of conference resources and on current and future requirements.

A senior executive committee, an intergovernmental body, and an expert group have responsibilities ranging broadly across the work of the whole UN system of organizations. The Administrative Committee on Coordination

(ACC)—composed of the UN Secretary General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies, the IAEA and other major bodies and programs—meets regularly to supervise the implementation of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and to coordinate the activities of the various organizations. The Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC), an intergovernmental body, serves as the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming and coordination. In accord with resolution 41/213, as explained below, the CPC has assumed an additional key role in implementation of the new consensus-based budget process. The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), a group of experts who serve full time, is empowered to investigate and evaluate any matter bearing on the efficiency of services and the proper use of funds.

Each of these bodies is concerned with some aspect of making the system work better. The highlights of their activities during 1988 are recounted in the sections that follow.

UN REFORM

Actions taken with regard to the key budget reform procedure at the 43rd General Assembly are discussed under the separate heading concerning the UN budget. To summarize the actions, decisions were taken by consensus on the Secretary General's 1990–1991 budget outline which: called for a 1990-1991 budget that is less in real terms than that approved for 1988–1989 and for establishing a contingency fund to cap budget add-ons at a level of 0.75 percent of the budget; approved in concept a reserve to cover fluctuations in inflation and currency exchange rates; and stressed the importance of priority setting in the budget, calling for a report on the subject to be submitted through the Committee for Program and Coordination to the next General Assembly.

With regard to UN reform overall, the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, on December 18, recommended without a vote a draft resolution on the status of implementation of UN reforms included in General Assembly resolution 41/213. A key provision in the draft resolution (A/C.5/43/L.19) was the reaffirmation of staff reductions in the UN Secretariat called for by recommendation 15 in the Group of 18 report. This recommendation called for a 15 percent reduction in the number of posts. The Secretary General proposed an overall staff reduction of 13.1 percent by the end of 1989 in the context of the 1988–1989 revised budget estimates, but indicated the proposed cuts assumed that a reduction in the level of conference servicing requirements would be achieved. Without such a reduction, it would be necessary to restore 100 of the 357 posts proposed for elimination by the Secretary General. However, given the lack of substantive movement on reducing the number of meetings and documentation, and concern over the possible decline in the quality of language services, the Committee for Program and Coordination recommended restoration of the conference servicing posts which would have resulted in an overall staffing cut of about 12 percent by the end of 1989. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) recommended that as a partial offset to the 100 posts that would be restored under the CPC formulation, 50 posts be eliminated in other UN departments and offices during the 1988–1989 biennium. The ACABQ stated that the costs for the balance of the posts should be absorbed within the 1988–1989 appropriation.

During the Fifth Committee's consideration of the revised 1988–1989 budget estimates, developing countries sought assurances from the Secretariat that implementation of mandated programs would not be negatively affected by the proposed staff cuts. These delegations were satisfied with the explanations provided by the Secretariat and no efforts were made to restore the number of posts beyond the 100 identified for the Department of Conference Services. However, the ACABQ recommendation to offset part of the restoration by reductions in other offices was opposed by a number of developing countries. Also, Secretariat officials argued that it was not possible to identify an additional 50 posts for elimination at this stage without disrupting programs.

The staffing issue was the key issue during informal consultations. The developing countries strongly opposed the ACABQ recommendation for eliminating 50 posts to partially offset the restoration, but there was general support for the ACABQ recommendation that the full cost of restoring the posts should be absorbed within the 1988–1989 appropriation. For the 1990–1991 biennium, the delegations agreed that the Secretary General should present proposals for absorbing the costs of the restored posts, including, to the maximum extent possible, through the elimination of an unspecified number of additional posts. The draft resolution that was ultimately recommended by the Fifth Committee makes references to the need for further implementation of recommendation 15 of the Group of 18 (achievement of the 15 percent staff reduction target). Many delegations observed that the staffing issue would be an important element in the next year's detailed review and deliberations regarding the Secretary General's proposed budget for the 1990–1991 biennium.

Included in the draft resolution is a provision requesting the Secretary General to submit to the General Assembly at its 45th session an analytical report assessing the effect of the implementation of resolution 41/213 on the organization and its activities as a whole, and how it has enhanced the efficiency of its administrative and financial functioning.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted without a vote resolution 43/213, Implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213: progress report and revised estimates for the biennium 1988–1989, and resolution 43/214, proposed program budget outline for the biennium 1990–1991 and use and operation of the contingency fund.

CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UN

At its third plenary meeting on September 23 the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, decided to include in the agenda of its 43rd session, and to allocate to the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee, the item entitled "Current Financial Crisis of the United Nations." The Fifth Committee considered this item concurrently with agenda item 116, "Financial Emergency of the United Nations," at its 45th to 47th, 49th and 51st meetings, on December 12–14, 16 and 19.

For consideration of this item, the Committee had before it the report of the Secretary General on the current financial crisis of the United Nations: current situation and funding prospects for 1989. The Secretary General's report indicated that as of November 30, 1988, approximately 35.5 percent of the UN's regular budget assessments remained unpaid, or $450.1 million. At that time, only 70 member states had paid their assessments in full.

The Secretary General's report noted that the 1988 end of year cash balance in the General Fund, to include the Working Capital Fund and the Special Account, was estimated to be $81.5 million. It was also noted that the cash projections made no allowances for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for peacekeeping operations before the end of 1988. If actual receipts followed the projected pattern, the organization's reserves (the Working Capital Fund and Special Account) would have a deficit of some $128 million.

The report indicated that any solution to the financial and political stability of the United Nations must deal simultaneously with the short and long term of which an essential component must be the full and timely payment by all member states of all assessed contributions in the year they are due. Another essential component of the solution would be the replenishment of reserves to enable the organization to deal with variances in the timing and amount of payment and with unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. The report noted that the most effective means of replenishing reserves is the payment of arrears. If member states do not pay their arrears, the Secretary General suggested that an alternative method would be interest free loans from member states or international entities.

In the report's conclusion, the Secretary General noted that the fragility of the organization's financial situation will continue so long as its reserves are not fully funded. He again emphasized that the only real solution to the current financial crisis is the payment by all member states of their assessed contributions in full and on time. So long as the reserves of the organization have not been fully reestablished, he would be obliged to continue to seek interest free loans from member states. The Secretary General also requested that those member states which are able to do so make advance payments in December 1988 on their estimated 1989 assessments.

Having considered the Secretary General's report, the Fifth Committee, on December 19, adopted without a vote a draft resolution on the current financial crisis of the United Nations. The draft resolution urged all member states to fulfill their financial obligations under the UN Charter. The resolution included a request that the Secretary General continue to monitor the organization's financial situation and keep the President of the General Assembly and chairmen of the regional groups informed so as to facilitate consideration by member states if the situation so requires. The Secretary General was also requested to communicate to all member states the latest information on the magnitude of the current financial crisis facing the organization and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its 44th session.

Reflecting the Fifth Committee's recommended draft resolution, the General Assembly, on December 21, adopted resolution 43/215 without a vote.

UN BUDGET

On December 19 the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee recommended by consensus revised UN budget appropriations for the 1988–1989 biennium. The revised 1988–1989 budget calls for a gross expenditure level of $1,788,746,300, or $19,160,000 over the level approved by the General Assembly at its 42nd session in 1987.

Budget add-ons for activities approved at the 43rd General Assembly totaled approximately $20.4 million which was offset by approximately $1.2 million in savings from the recosting of the 1988–1989 budget. The recosting of the budget took into account December 1988 exchange rates, current estimates of inflation and adjustments for staff costs. The bulk of the expenditure increase resulted from the adoption of the Secretary General's revised estimates for the UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan (UNGOMAP) and the proposal for an integrated management information system (IMIS). The appropriation for UNGOMAP ($13.9 million including staff assessment) would provide funding through the end of 1989. However, if the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan were to be met, the actual costs of UNGOMAP would likely be lower than the amount appropriated, with the savings returned to member states. The appropriation for the integrated management information system ($3.8 million including staff assessment) would finance the start-up costs of the project. In a separate decision, the Fifth Committee recommended that the total costs of the initial phase of the project not exceed a total of $28 million (at 1988 prices). Approximately two-thirds of the cost of the project would be financed from the UN regular budget. Funding of the balance of the UN share would be included in subsequent biennial budgets. Other major add-ons approved included costs pertaining to the Secretary General's Special Representative for the Western Sahara ($687,900), amounts relating to holding the General Assembly session on the Palestine issue in Geneva

($440,700), and revised estimates resulting from the decisions of the Economic and Social Council ($371,300).

Despite the net increase of approximately $19.2 million in the 1988–1989 expenditure level, the U.S. assessment for 1989 of approximately $216.3 million was only about $2.3 million higher than the 1988 assessment. The impact of the expenditure increase on assessments was reduced by an increase of approximately $10 million in income. Of this amount, $5 million related to a voluntary contribution to UNGOMAP from Japan. Increases in general income and from UN revenue-producing activities accounted for the balance.

Because approximately three-quarters of the 1988–1989 expenditure increase related to UN peacekeeping operations in Afghanistan and the Western Sahara, activities which the United States supports, the U.S. Delegation joined consensus in approving the revised 1988–1989 UN budget. In its explanatory statement of the U.S. position on the 1988–1989 revised budget, the U.S. Delegation noted that

> . . . a substantial portion of the additional expenditures are devoted to activities which are critically important or will strengthen the organization. This is a significant change from previous years when additional funds were voted for activities which were marginally useful, and, in some cases, politically divisive.

The United States further noted that

> . . . the 1988–1989 budget is the last to be approved before the new budgetary process approved in General Assembly resolution 41/213 becomes fully operational. The budget outline and contingency fund will allow for greater predictability in the level of resources. In particular, the contingency fund will eliminate the idea of unconstrained budget add-ons. We would point out that, had such a fund been approved for 1988–1989, at the level recommended by the Secretary General, it would have been sufficient to finance those budget add-ons approved at the 42nd and 43rd sessions which fall within the established guidelines.

In summarizing the U.S. decision to join consensus on the revised 1988–1989 UN budget estimates, the U.S. statement concluded with the following cautionary note:

> In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the United States believes the revised appropriations reflect continued restraint by the Secretary General and member states. For this reason, we have joined the consensus on the decision taken on the revised appropriations. We believe, however, that even greater efforts could have been made to limit the overall increase in the budget.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted without a vote resolution 43/218 approving the revised 1988–1989 UN budget estimates as recommended by the Fifth Committee.

Concerning action taken on the budget for the 1990–1991 biennium, the Fifth Committee on December 19 adopted by consensus a draft resolution approving the 1990–1991 budget outline. The draft resolution represented a major step forward in implementing the wide-ranging reforms agreed upon in 1986 in General Assembly resolution 41/213. The draft resolution, which was consistent with the September 1988 decision of the Committee on Program and Coordination, included the following elements:

— Established a budget level of $1,767,060,000 at 1988 rates (equivalent to $1,982,523,700 at 1990–1991 rates) which represents a decline in real terms from the approved 1988-89 budget.

— Sets the contingency fund at 0.75 percent of the budget, or $15 million at 1990–1991 rates.

— Approved, in concept, a reserve to cover fluctuations in inflation and currency, with details to be addressed at the next General Assembly.

— Stressed the importance of priority setting, calling for a report on the subject to be submitted through the Committee on Program and Coordination to the next General Assembly.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, the draft resolution on the 1990–1991 budget outline recommended by the Fifth Committee (General Assembly resolution 43/214). The U.S. statement was delivered by Noel L. Gross, Alternate U.S. Representative to the 43rd General Assembly. In stating the U.S. position for joining consenus on the resolution Ms. Gross noted

> . . . this decision represents a major step forward in implementing the wide-ranging administrative and budgetary reforms approved 2 years ago in resolution 41/213. It provides the Secretary General with the policy guidance he needs to produce a budget whose size and content reflect the views of all member states.

In reference to the new budget process called for under resolution 41/213, Ms. Gross stated,

> . . . all delegations can take satisfaction in the fact that this phase of the revised budget process has worked well. The Secretary General's proposed outline, the first of its kind, provided a sound basis for review by member states. The Committee for Program and Coordination examined the proposed outline and reached consensus on its substance. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, within the terms of its mandate, provided essential technical clarifications. Finally, the Fifth Committee, through a series of informal consulations, pulled all the strands together and produced the resolution which the Assembly has just adopted without a vote.

In looking to the future, Ms. Gross emphasized that

> . . . the work of the Secretary General and of the member states in developing and approving the budget for 1990–1991 will now begin in earnest, with the understanding that a broad consensus exists in what the budget will contain. It is also necessary to realize that the outline just approved is a first effort, and improvements can be expected in the future. For example, member states, with the assistance of the Secretary General, will need to address the issues of program priorities and of currency and inflation fluctuations at the next session. The resolution has asked for specific inputs from the Secretary General on both topics, and we look forward to discussing them at the 44th session.

AUDIT REPORTS

At its 7th to 10th, 12th to 14th, 27th and 28th meetings, on October 12–14, 18, 20, 21 and 24 , and November 9–10, the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee considered the financial reports and audited financial statements for the period ended December 31, 1987, and reports and audit opinions of the Board of Auditors concerning the following: United Nations, including the International Trade Center and the UN University, the UN Development Program (UNDP), the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), the voluntary funds administered by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the UN Environment Program (UNEP), the UN Population Fund, the UN Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation, and the related report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ).

The Board of Auditors issued qualified audit opinions on the financial statements of the United Nations, the UN Development Program and the UN Population Fund, and also issue qualified audit opinions on compliance with the financial regulations and legislative authority on the transactions of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine in the Near East and the International Trade Center.

The Board's qualified opinion for the United Nations was based essentially on a technical matter concerning unpaid assessed contributions from member states. As noted in paragraph 358 of the audit report, "the Board's opinion on the financial statement is subject to the ultimate realization of these assets." Notwithstanding the technical qualification of the Board's opinion, the audit report contained a great number of comments and recommendations for improving financial, administrative and management practices through a spectrum of UN operations. Some of the problems noted included the inconsistent application of financial regulation 4.3 concerning the raising and recording of unliquidated obligations, the need for improved control over expendable and nonexpendable property, weaknessess in internal controls concerning the UN's system for allowances and entitlements, weaknesses with regard to negotiation, bidding and award of contracts, and several operational and financial management problems of the UN Postal Authority. In her statement before the Fifth Committee, the U.S. Representative, Ms. Kathleen Chisholm, noted with concern the many comments and recommendations for improvement cited by the Board and urged the Secretary General to take, as quickly as possible, the necessary steps toward implementing the Board's recommendations.

Although the Board of Auditors qualified its opinion on the financial statements of the UN Development Program (UNDP), the Board noted that significant improvements were achieved by the Administrator during 1987. A major reason for the qualification was the inadequacy of UNDP's established financial procedures for auditing other agencies and governments which implement UNDP projects. The Board's view on the delivery concept for equipment and unliquidated obligations against budgetary appropriations was another major contributing factor to the qualification.

The issue of UNDP's procedures for auditing agencies and governments which execute UNDP-financed projects first arose in the 1986 audit. The Board was concerned that these procedures introduced uncertainties affecting a substantial portion of reported expenditures and obligations. The Board and the UNDP administration agreed that the question of the scope of the audit of executing agencies should be addressed by the Panel of External Auditors and the relevant governing bodies. As a result of discussions with the Panel, audit certificates were issued for agencies representing two-thirds of 1987 program expenditure. These certificates were issued in time for the Board's review and reflected a significant improvement from the previous year.

Of particular concern to the United States was the auditor's finding that executing agencies of UNDP projects have charged certain expenditures to project budgets rather than pay them from support cost earnings. Because of financial difficulties experienced by UN organizations, in 1987, the administration issued new guidelines authorizing the charging of the costs of technical backstopping visits to project budgets. Concerning this matter, the U.S. Representative, Ms. Chisholm, noted that

> . . . we do not believe it is appropriate for UNDP to provide financial support of this type to other UN agencies. The Governing Council approved additional support cost payments to several executing agencies, although many delegations did not believe they were justified. The Council will undoubtedly consider the subsidies provided by UNDP to executing agencies through project expenditures in its upcoming review of support costs.

Concerning the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the audit opinion of the Board notes that ". . . the transactions were in accordance with the financial regulations and legislative authority, except for the effects of observations mentioned in paragraph 21 of our report." At the time of the closing of the 1987 accounts, the administration introduced a new accounting policy that provides for the recording of both contributions in kind and in cash on the cash basis of accounting. Although the action was taken in response to a 1986 recommendation of the Board, it was not discussed with the external auditors prior to implementation. The Board was of the opinion that the action exceeded the scope of the 1986 recommendation (recommendation pertained to contributions in kind only). It was also of the opinion that such a hasty restatement of the 1987 accounts was unjustified and that ". . . it would have been more appropriate to modify the financial regulations in compliance with the proper procedures before introducing the new accounting policy rather than the other way around." In response to the Board's recommendation, the administration agreed to take action to amend the financial regulations.

The 1987 audit of the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) indicates that significant progress has been made toward the goal of improved financial accountability. In her statement, Ms. Chisholm noted ". . . the U.S. Delegation would like to express its gratitude to the Board of Auditors for its excellent and thorough work on its expanded audit and the revision of the accounts for 1986. We are pleased that solutions have been found to a number of serious problems." However, she cautioned that some issues, particularly those relating to supplementary funding have not been fully resolved. In concluding her statement concerning the audit report of UNICEF, Ms. Chisholm noted,

> . . . as we have stated previously, both here and in the UNICEF Executive Board, financial accountability cannot be treated as a secondary issue. It is clearly in the interest of all parties concerned—donors, recipients and UNICEF—for the organization to be beyond reproach in financial matters. To do otherwise only serves to erode the support and goodwill that UNICEF currently enjoys.

With regard to the reports of the Board of Auditors in general, the U.S. Delegation suggested that future reports devote greater attention to management issues and that the summary of findings in each audit report should clearly distinguish the most serious findings from those which are less critical in nature. In view of the large number of findings in many reports, it is not always immediately clear which deserve the most attention. Also, as requested in General Assembly resolution 41/176, the U.S. Delegation called for more detailed analysis in future reports of the actions taken by management to implement recommendations from the previous year.

At its 28th meeting on November 10, the Fifth Committee adopted, without a vote, draft resolution A/C.5/43/L.4 concerning Financial Reports and Audited Financial Statements, and Reports of the Board of Auditors. *Inter alia,* the draft resolution accepted the audit opinions and reports of the Board of Auditors and requested the competent governing bodies to ensure that the executive heads concerned take the necessary steps on a priority basis to implement the recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as contained in their respective reports, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its 44th session.

The General Assembly, on December 21, adopted, without a vote, resolution 43/216, Financial Reports and Audited Financial Statements, and Reports of the Board of Auditors.

FINANCING PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

The 43rd UN General Assembly adopted three resolutions relating to the financing of UN peacekeeping activities. All were adopted by the Assembly upon recommendation of the Fifth Committee.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted resolution 43/228 concerning the financing of the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF). The resolution was adopted by a vote of 132 (U.S.) in favor, with 2 opposed and 8 abstentions. Under the terms of the resolution, the General Assembly decided to appropriate $17,664,000 gross ($17,358,000 net) for the operation of UNDOF for the period June 1, 1988, to November 30, 1988, inclusive, and $18,114,000 for the period from December 1, 1988, to May 31, 1989, inclusive. The resolution also authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments for UNDOF at a rate not to exceed $3,019,000 gross ($2,963,000 net) per month for the period from June 1 to November 30, 1989, inclusive, should the Security Council decide to continue the force beyond the period of 6 months authorized under its resolution 624 (1988).

In consideration of the arrangements for financing the peace-keeping operation, the resolution calls for the apportionment of $18,114,000 among member states in accord with the approved UN scale. The scale of assessments for the year 1988 (per scale approved under resolution 40/248) shall be applied against $3,019,000 to the period ending December 31, 1988, and the scale of assessments for the year 1989 (per scale approved under resolution 43/223) shall be applied against the balance, that is, $15,095,000, for the period thereafter.

By a vote of 134 (U.S.) in favor, 1 against, and 8 abstentions, the General Assembly on December 21 adopted resolution 43/229 regarding the financing of the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). An amount of $141,180,000 was appropriated for the operation of UNIFIL for the period February 1, 1988, to January 31, 1989, inclusive. Financing of this amount was apportioned among member states in accord with the UN scale of assessments for 1988 and 1989. The scale of assessments for 1988 (per resolution 40/248) was applied to $129,415,000 for the period February 1 to December 31, 1988. The scale of assessments for 1989 was applied against the balance, that is, $11,765,000 for the period thereafter. The resolution also authorized the Secretary General to enter commitments for the operation of UNIFIL at a rate not to exceed $11,903,500 gross ($11,714,500 net) per month for the 12-month period beginning February 1, 1989, should the Security Council decide to continue the force beyond the period of 6 months authorized under its resolution 617 (1988).

By its resolution 619 (1988) of August 9, the Security Council established a new UN peacekeeping activity, the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG). The initial mandate period of the force would extend from August 9, 1988, through February 8, 1989. On August 16 the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee recommended to the General Assembly a draft resolution appropriating an amount of $35.7 million for the operation of UNIIMOG for an initial period of approximately 3 months of the authorized 6- month mandate period, and requested the Secretary General to establish a special account for the financing of the activity. The General Assembly endorsed the Fifth Committee's draft resolution on August 17, 1988, by adopting without a vote resolution 42/233 which, *inter alia*, apportioned $35,000,000 among member states for the financing of UNIIMOG for the 3 months beginning August 9. In accord with the special peacekeeping scale of assessments, the U.S. share of the apportioned amount was $10,940,779.

Resolution 42/233 also called for including in the agenda of the 43rd session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Financing of the United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group," and requested the Secretary General to submit, through the Advisory Committee on Budgetary Questions, to the General Assembly by October 1, 1988, an updated report on the financing of UNIIMOG, including the status of voluntary contributions. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to take all necessary action to ensure that UNIIMOG is administered with a maximum of efficiency and economy.

The General Assembly on September 23 decided to include in the agenda of its 43rd session the item entitled "Financing of the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group." The Fifth Committee considered the item at its 25th, 29th, 33rd, 35th, 36th, 37th and 50th meetings on November 4, 11, 17, 18, 21 and 23 and December 18. At the 50th meeting on December 18, the Fifth Committee adopted, without a vote, a draft resolution on the financing of UNIIMOG. The draft resolution recommended additional funding of $18,300,000 for the period November 9 to February 8, in addition to the $35,700,000 previously appropriated, for the 6-month mandate period extending from August 9, 1988, to February 8, 1989. The scale of assessments applicable to 1988 would be applied to $6,854,300 for the period ending December 31, and the scale of assessments applicable to 1989 would be applied to the $11,455,700 balance thereafter. The U.S. assessment for the second 3 months of the 6-month mandate period amounted to $5,621,058. The resolution also authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments not to exceed $7,986,000 gross ($7,889,000 net) per month should the Security Council decide to extend the mandate of UNIIMOG beyond the initial 6-month period.

The Fifth Committee draft resolution addressed issues concerning treatment of voluntary contributions to UNIIMOG. The initial UNIIMOG resolution adopted in August invited voluntary contributions, but specified that they could be used only as advances, to be repaid to donors at the end of the operation. In its report on UNIIMOG, the Advisory Committee on Budgetary Questions recommended that voluntary cash contributions should be offset against total assessments, and called for the Secretary General to formulate technical guidelines for the valuation of in-kind contributions.

In formal and informal discussions in the Fifth Committee, there was little difficulty with crediting cash contributions, but many delegations were concerned about in-kind contributions substituting for the payment of assessments. The U.S. Delegation lobbied hard to avoiding exclusion of in-kind advances, stating that authorities previously given to the Secretary General to accept advances should not be removed on the basis of only partial knowledge by the Fifth Committee. The resolution, finally approved by the Committee, provided that voluntary cash grants will reduce total assessments, but does not specify when the voluntary contributions made earlier by Japan ($10,000,000) and Morocco ($1,000,000) would be deducted. Cash advances would be handled as they were with the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) and the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), unless otherwise specified by the donor. In-kind outright grants are acceptable and may be used eventually to reduce total assessments. The Secretary General was asked to submit a report at the earliest possible stage containing technical guidelines relating to both the treatment and valuation of in-kind contributions. Implicitly, the Secretary General can continue to exercise existing authorities regarding in-kind provision of goods and services in the interim.

The General Assembly adopted the Fifth Committee recommendations on December 21, under resolution 43/230. The resolution was adopted without a vote.

SCALES OF ASSESSMENT

On December 19 the UN's Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee recommended, without a vote, a draft resolution on the scale of assessments. On December 21 the UN General Assembly adopted without a vote resolution 43/223 which reflected the Fifth Committee's recommendations concerning the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations for the period 1989 through 1991.

Part A of resolution 43/223 resolves a scale for 1989 and 1990, and also 1991 unless a new scale is approved earlier by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions in response to the provisions outlined in Part B of the resolution. There was no change in the 25 percent ceiling rate assessed the United States. Part B of the resolution requests the Committee on Contributions to undertake a comprehensive review of all aspects of the current methodology for determining assessments and to report its findings to the General Assembly at its 44th session. While a review of the ceiling rate is not specifically requested, the Committee on Contributions is not precluded from addressing the issue. If a new methodology is adopted at the next session, the Committee will be required to propose a new scale for implementation in 1991.

Debate in the Fifth Committee on this agenda item evolved along traditional lines. The scale proposed by the Committee on Contributions marginally increased the assessments of some developing countries. The delegations of middle income developing countries and the OPEC states expressed strong reservations about the scale. Only a few delegations, particularly Canada and Australia, supported the proposed scale. A number of delegations proposed revisions of the current methodology for calculating the scale. Since a thorough review of the methodology had not been undertaken since 1985, there was wide support for a resolution providing detailed instructions to the Committee on Contributions. Those G-77 delegations dissatisfied with the proposed scale, particularly India, Brazil and Iran, supported by Norway and Canada, recommended the review of existing aspects of the methodology, as well as consideration of several new elements. Major contributing countries noted that virtually all of the elements under consideration had been studied by the Committee on Contributions in the past. They recalled that the Committee on Contributions, in some cases, was unable to revise existing elements or incorporate new ones because of the lack of data. In other cases, the proposed changes in methodology, when tested, did not result in the expected redistribution of assessments. These delegations did not oppose further review of these proposals by the Committee on Contributions since the results are not likely to be different.

There were wide differences among delegations concerning the reference to current ceiling and floor rates in the resolution. In view of these differences, the resolution does not specifically request the Committee on Contributions to consider implications of a lower ceiling rate, although it is not prohibited from taking such a view. Major contributors, concerned about increases in their assessments through a reduction in the ceiling, insisted on the inclusion of a paragraph in the operative section of the resolution reconfirming that capacity to pay is the fundamental criterion for determining the scale of assessments.

In view of the divergent opinions regarding the proposed scale and the methodology used to determine such a scale, the Fifth Committee agreed that the proposed scale should be adopted only for 2 years. If no changes in the methodology are accepted, the scale approved for 1989–1990 would be extended to 1991. To accommodate the concerns of two G-77 delegations who sought to reduce their assessments, a reference to rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly was included in the resolution which allows member states to appeal their assessment levels to the Committee on Contributions. Reference to this rule was accepted based on an informal understanding that no member state would have its assessment increased involuntarily if reductions are provided to other member states.

In a statement after adoption of the draft resolution by the Fifth Committee, the U.S. Delegation made the following points:

— The draft resolution would neither improve the methodology for determining the scale nor contribute to wider agreement on future scales of assessments;

— the United States has never accepted without reservations capacity to pay as the fundamental criterion for determining the scale, and objected to the operative paragraph of the resolution which reconfirms capacity to pay;

— the United States notes that many of the studies requested on existing and proposed elements of the methodology for determining the scale had been undertaken in the past. The Committee on Contributions found that the proposed elements could not be implemented for technical reasons, or did not produce the desired results (i.e., lower assessments for developing countries);

— the United States objects to the study requested in operative paragraph five of Part B that requested that the Committee on Contributions find a way of constructing the scale which would avoid the negative impact of one special provision on other special provisions.

COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAM AND COORDINATION

The Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC) is the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming and coordination. In addition, one of the key elements of the 1986 package of major UN administrative and budgetary reforms (Resolution 41/213) accorded CPC a central role in the UN's new, consensus budgeting process. Thus the Committee plays a vital role in U.S. efforts to exercise appropriate influence on the size and priorities of UN program budgets.

Committee members are nominated by ECOSOC on the basis of regional balance and elected on a staggered basis by the General Assembly for 3-year terms. The Committee presently consists of 34 member states.*

In 1988 CPC held a lengthy, split session in order to deal with its greatly increased workload. It met in New York from May 2 to June 3 and again from September 6–19. The major topics considered were (1) the proposed outline for the UN Program Budget for the 1990–1991 biennium and related issues; (2) revisions to the Medium-Term Plan for 1990–1991; (3) program coordination issues; (4) review of certain evaluation activities; and (5) cross-organizational program analyses (COPAs).

ECOSOC reviewed portions of CPC's report at both its summer session and its resumed session in the autumn. It endorsed CPC's conclusions and recommendations in resolutions 1988/62 on July 27 and 1988/184 on October 17. The 43rd General Assembly considered the CPC report under its program planning and other agenda items. CPC's recommendations and conclusions, including those on the 1990–1991 budget outline, were approved without change and without vote on December 21. (Resolutions 43/213, 43/214 and 43/219.)

Proposed Outline for the UN Program Budget for 1990–1991

CPC successfully completed its most important task for the 1988 session when it reached consensus agreement on a proposed budget outline for

---

*Membership in 1988 was as follows: Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia and Zambia.

1990–1991. Achieving consensus on this outline was a major objective for the United States in CPC. The U.S. Delegation had sought agreement primarily on an overall budget level that was lower in real terms than that approved for 1988–1989; a contingency fund of appropriate size in order to cap budget add-ons; and continued progress toward the staff reduction target of 15 percent which was established in General Assembly resolution 41/213. Achievement of these goals was crucial to the continued and orderly flow of U.S. financial support to the organization. This was no easy task and debate and negotiation on the proposed budget and its programmatic implications was lengthy.

Since this was the first real test of the budgetary process adopted in 1986 under General Assembly resolution 41/213, all delegations exercised caution in setting precedents for future outlines. CPC discussions focused on three issues: staff reductions, additional expenditures and the contingency fund. Noting the preliminary nature of the expenditure estimates in the outline and the fact that this was the first such exercise, many members neither accepted nor rejected the Secretary General's proposals specifically. However, there was general agreement that the methodology used to determine the budget figures was adequately explained and justified by the Secretariat.

Accordingly, agreement was reached eventually on every issue except on how to reflect program priorities in the budget. Here CPC reached only limited agreement on some aspects of the topic. It agreed that it would consider the distribution of resources among parts of the budget, as given in the budget outline, to be illustrative only and that the proposed distribution of staff resources would not be considered as representing the establishment of priorities among the various activities of the organization.

In addition, CPC emphasized the need for the Secretary General, in developing his detailed program budget for 1990–1991, to reflect the priorities deriving from the current UN medium-term plan, as revised. It further noted the relevance of the Regulations and Rules Governing Program Planning, the Program Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation. Finally, it requested the Secretary General to present a report for consideration at its 1989 session on the approach, particularly the methodological aspects to be adopted, for identifying priorities reflecting general trends of a broad sectoral nature in future program budget outlines.

Revisions to the Medium-Term Plan

One longstanding part of CPC program planning mandate is its biennial review of proposed revisions to the UN Medium-Term Plan (MTP). Although a new MTP was due to receive its initial review at the 1988 session of CPC, one part of the reform effort underway in the United Nations was a decision taken in 1987 to extend the life of the 1984–1989 MTP for 2 years; that is, until the end of 1991. This was adopted as a one-time alternation in the MTP schedule in the hope that the next plan could reflect more fully the results of the reform effort and other reviews. Also, it was thought desirable to try to resolve the UN financial problems before adopting a new MTP.

Therefore, the Committee once again reviewed the Secretary General's recommended revisions to the 1984–1989 Plan. Always a major task for CPC, consideration of these revisions at the 28th session consumed a great deal of time. The U.S. objectives for the exercise were achieved. Objectionable language was eliminated on the Soviet-proposed Comprehensive System of International Security, the Office of Research and Collection of Information and outer space matters; additional language on debt and development was kept reasonable; myriad proposals by the Commission on the Status of Women were preserved; and the Geneva Working Party's consensus package on UNCTAD was not weakened.

A related topic under this agenda item was the ongoing reorganization of the Department of Public Information (DPI). After reviewing the proposals put forward by the Secretary General, some developing countries immediately voiced opposition to the proposed streamlining as being prejudicial to programs related to economic development and radio broadcasting, particularly anti-apartheid programs. The United States joined other reform-minded delegations in stressing the imperative to keep agreed post reductions on schedule, to respect the Secretary General's authority as the UN's chief administrator, and to leave negotiation of substantive mandates to the competent bodies. In the end, CPC's report reflected a compromise among these concerns and recommended that the General Assembly keep DPI reorganization under review.

CPC also considered proposals regarding the introduction to and structure of the next MTP. While it was generally agreed that the important question of priorities had been neglected in the introduction, CPC could not agree on guidance to give the Secretariat. There was much disagreement over the Secretary General's proposed new structure. Many member states inferred that the proposed streamlining of the MTP's structure meant reduction in programs, and compromise proved impossible. Accordingly, CPC was forced to send the proposals on to the General Assembly's Fifth Committee without endorsement. The Committee did, however, recommend that the next plan's length be 6 years, and it approved without difficulty the proposed calendar of consultations for review of the next plan.

Program Performance for 1986–1987

Under this topic CPC reviewed a report on delivery of outputs programed in the Plan and Budget. While some delegations claimed that program performance had been reduced as a result of the financial crisis, the United States and others noted that the report indicated the Secretariat had actually done more with less. The percentage drop in performance was caused by the many new requirements levied on the Secretary General during this period.

Most delegations concentrated on the genuine difficulty of drawing valid conclusions from the data presented and the need to improve methodology for data collection and presentation. In particular, the lack of even rough comparability among outputs was widely criticized.

The United States noted that the absolute number of outputs delivered actually increased slightly over the 1984–1985 level despite funding shortfalls.

Eventually, the Committee was able to agree on a few revisions to the principles for compiling the report and encouraged the Secretariat to improve the standardization of outputs in order to clarify better the information being presented. The Committee also recommended that qualitative analysis be incorporated into the report.

CPC also reviewed a progress report on implementation of the 1986 reform resolution, 41/213. Discussions centered on the on-going staff reductions in the Secretariat, their true size, and above all, their estimated impact on program delivery. The Committee recalled that reductions were to be made with flexibility, avoiding negative impact on programs and on Secretariat efficiency, competence, integrity and geographical diversity; reaffirmed the 15 percent target for staff reductions; and called for special consideration for smaller UN offices, especially those handling peace and security matters, disarmament, regional commissions, and economic and social programs, including narcotics control programs.

Review of Evaluation Activities

The in-depth evaluation report scheduled for 1988 dealt with the program on development issues and policies in the United Nations. As the Secretariat had been unable to prepare the report for 1988, it was deferred until the Committee's 1989 session.

CPC gave rapid consideration to the other evaluation reports on the agenda. It reviewed a progress report on the in-depth evaluation of the topic of human settlements, which is due for presentation in 1990. The progress report was approved and the Committee indicated those parts of the survey on which it wished more emphasis placed, principally topics related to coordination and planning.

CPC took note of a follow-up report on the work of the DPI and a similar report on distribution policies at UN information centers. It also considered a triennial review of implementation of recommendations made by the Committee in 1985 on the work of the drug control programs. CPC called for effective implementation of all existing arrangements for coordination and requested further consideration of a proposal to merge the Division of Narcotic Drugs with the Secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board. The Committee also reviewed a report on the application of evaluation findings in program design, delivery and policy directives. It reaffirmed the importance of the evaluation function and supported its further strengthening.

The Committee also quickly reviewed the work program of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) for 1988 and recommended, in accordance with longstanding U.S. views, that the Unit place even more emphasis on the evaluation aspect of its work. CPC further recommended that from time to time the Unit should evaluate the implementation of recommendations made in previous reports. CPC did not review any specific JIU reports.

Cross-Organizational Program Analyses

COPAs are a mechanism for assisting ECOSOC in the implementation of its Charter responsibility to coordinate the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Each year CPC reviews several COPAs, either completed, in progress, or in follow-up. However, in 1988, because of its greatly increased workload, CPC also looked more critically at the overall quality of its documentation. The Committee made several critical comments about COPAs and how they are presented, stressing the need for clarity, consistency, and an absence of ambiguity in the definition and presentation of data. The Committee called for more precise and action-oriented conclusions and for recommendations to be presented by the Secretariat. These criticisms were also meant to improve follow-up reports. The Economic and Social Council, however, decided to discontinue COPAs and replace them with brief, thematic analyses in the future. (Resolution 1988/77.)

The 1988 COPA dealt with activities of the UN system in the area of the environment. The Committee was dissatisfied with this report, citing a lack of both in-depth analysis and critical review of programs. The recommendations and conclusions were also judged inadequate. In discussions on this topic, CPC was unable to reach a consensus on the proper relationship between economic development and concern for the environment. Although members did agree that more funding was needed for environmental projects, developing countries repeated their position that no money for this should be taken from development activities. In the end, CPC could only agree on a set of vague recommendations for more cooperation on this topic by agencies and system-wide standardization of data bases related to environmental issues.

CPC also reviewed a follow-up report, requested at its 1987 session, on implementation of recommendations made in a previous COPA on human settlements. CPC was not satisfied with this report and requested a more responsive one for its 1989 session.

CPC also reviewed a preliminary report on the proposed methodology to be used for completing the COPA on the advancement of women, due for presentation in 1989. While comments on the report were generally favorable, a number of countries expressed concern that areas of particular interest, such as the status of women in certain definite geographical areas such as Palestine, should have been specifically mentioned in the report's statement of scope. The United States suggested that the definition of the field of activity could be improved by inclusion of priority themes directly related to the three main program objectives adopted at the Nairobi Conference.

At the recommendation of the Secretary General, CPC agreed on the theme of industrial development as the 1990 COPA topic. Human resources, the topic put forward by several Western countries, was given a general endorsement for a COPA in the near future.

CPC also briefly reviewed a follow-up on the 1986 COPA on economic and social research and policy analysis in the UN system. The Committee judged this report to be too vague in its recommendations as well as incomplete in its coverage and requested that a revised report be submitted at a later date.

JOINT INSPECTION UNIT

The JIU consists of 11 inspectors chosen for their background and knowledge,* who are authorized to investigate matters pertaining to efficient and effective operations in the UN system. The Unit focuses on improving the management of UN programs and agencies and encouraging greater coordination at all levels. The JIU statute is currently adhered to by 16 agencies in the UN system.

In 1988 the JIU published seven reports and two notes on the following topics: monitoring, evaluation and management review of UN programs; evaluation of UN technical cooperation evaluation systems; use of equipment provided to technical cooperation projects; representation of UN organizations at conferences and meetings; UN system contributions to the preservation of the cultural and natural heritage in Western Asia; support for the foreign services of Latin America; administration of sick leave; and removal costs. Most of the 1988 reports had applicability across the UN system. However, many of the reports were circulated very late in the year and therefore could not be addressed by intergovernmental bodies until 1989.

For the United States, the most important report was the first issued during the year: *Reporting on the Performance and Results of United Nations Programs: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Management Review Components*. It was an exhaustively researched report documenting the failure of the UN Secretariat over the years to implement the many resolutions and expressions of the will of member states in support of a workable, reliable method of conducting program evaluation. The JIU report not only made its case in annotated detail, it also put forward four specific proposals for improvement.

---

*JIU inspectors are appointed by the General Assembly to serve in a personal capacity for 5-year terms. Richard V. Hennes of the United States was an inspector during 1988.

The Fifth Committee discussed the JIU report during consideration of the agenda item on program planning. The United States sought a resolution that would compel the Secretariat to make tangible improvements. That goal was largely achieved. On December 21 the Assembly without a vote adopted a resolution (43/219 III), recommended by the Fifth Committee, that stressed the need for improving the monitoring and evaluation functions in the United Nations, and went on to endorse the four JIU recommendations.

The first JIU recommendation was that the Secretary General should replace the current program performance report with one that analyzed progress made and results achieved against the established objectives for each subprogram. The performance report would be submitted concurrently with the biennial program budget in order finally to join "results" information with "intentions" information. The Assembly asked the Secretary General to undertake some specific applications using the JIU-suggested format and to report back on the "methodological and practical aspects" of implementing the recommendation.

The second recommendation called for strengthening the evaluation function in various ways: adding professional staff to the central evaluation and monitoring units; improving evaluation activities in those units (including the regional commissions, UNRWA, UNHCR and the Department of Technical Cooperation for Development) which expend the most resources; increase evaluation training for all staff in order to enhance the self-evaluation system; and ensure that the intergovernmental bodies in specific substantive areas act on the relevant program planning and budgeting documents. The Assembly endorsed this recommendation while noting the Secretary General's comment that some additional staff had already been added to the evaluation and monitoring units.

The third recommendation proposed an annual in-depth review from the Secretariat on management improvement actions and results. The Assembly asked the Secretary General to submit "concrete proposals" for prompt implementation of this proposal.

Finally, the JIU called for the Secretary General to give high priority to establishing a computerized management information system that would integrate both performance and financial information and thus improve decision-making in both the Secretariat and intergovernmental bodies. The Assembly noted this recommendation and endorsed the Secretary General's view that the recommendation should be incorporated into an integrated management information system for the entire Secretariat.

As part of a separate omnibus resolution on budget questions (43/217, part XII), adopted, without a vote, on December 21, the Assembly approved the expenditure of $28 million for the implementation of the first phase of such an integrated management information system over the next 42 months. The

United States, while supporting in principle such a system, had voted against the appropriation in the Fifth Committee on the grounds that it was too far-reaching, too expensive and not sufficiently justified by a cost-benefit analysis.

In its 1988 annual report to the General Assembly, the JIU discussed at length the actions it had taken to comply with a 42nd General Assembly resolution designed to strengthen various aspects of the Unit's work. Most of the proposals in the resolution had, in fact, been suggested by the Unit in its 1987 report to the Assembly. The Unit reported that it will allow other organizations in the UN system a voice in choosing future work programs; it will adopt a more collective approach by its inspectors to the proposed content of JIU reports; it will report on implementation of recommendations made in past reports; it will continue to carry out more evaluation-oriented surveys; it had published its guidelines for selecting, conducting and reporting the results of its inspections; and it will strive to increase the timeliness of its reports.

The Fifth Committee took cognizance of the JIU's annual report and welcomed the measures introduced. On October 20, without a vote, it approved a draft resolution that contained further requests and recommendations.

Inter alia, the proposed resolution requested the JIU to (1) continue its efforts to improve its effectiveness, particularly with regard to the new section of its annual report on implementation of previous recommendations; (2) limit, where possible, the narrative part of reports, expand the evaluative part and offer "practical and feasible" recommendations for improvement; (3) consider a more selective approach in drawing up its work plan in order to limit the quantity and improve the quality of its reporting; (4) provide more advice to participating organizations on their methods of internal evaluation and do more *ad hoc* evaluations of programs and activities; (5) give greater attention to management, budgetary and administrative issues, including those identified by the ACABQ in its reports on administrative coordination, and by the Board of Auditors; and (6) recommend new procedures to encourage more detailed consideration of its reports by the appropriate bodies of the UN system.

The proposed resolution also made several requests of the Secretary General. It asked him to expedite the earliest possible review of JIU reports and to ensure maintenance of an efficient and effective research capability within the secretariat of the Unit. The resolution also reiterated the importance which the General Assembly placed on the professional competence of the inspectors and the need to adhere to the highest standards in their selection.

This resolution was adopted by the General Assembly in plenary session, without a vote, on December 21. (Resolution 43/221.)

COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES

The Committee on Conferences held its substantive session during the period August 17–26. The key items on the agenda concerned the Committee's future mandate and status, and its future size and composition. While the Committee was able to reach agreement on its future mandate and status, it was unable to agree on the question of its future size and composition. After exhaustive negotiations on the mandate, the United States, along with the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union, successfully secured reference in the mandate to the Committee's role in the budgetary process. In light of the Committee's reluctance last year to accept any reference to recommendation 1(D) of the Group of 18 report, the concurrence of Committee members was a major positive event on this difficult issue. The Committee agreed to recommend to the General Assembly that the terms of reference of the Committee on Conferences be as follows:

— To plan and coordinate conferences and meetings in close consultation with the Secretariat and all relevant bodies in the preparation of the draft calendar; in particular, this should be achieved by staggering conferences and meetings throughout the year and should avoid to the maximum extent possible the overlapping of meetings related to the same sector of activity in the same location.

— To examine the Secretary General's proposals on the draft calendar prepared on the basis of his budgetary proposals and to recommend to the General Assembly a draft calendar of conferences and meetings designed to meet the needs of the United Nations and to ensure the optimum utilization of conference servicing resources. With respect to proposed departures from the calendar that have administrative and financial implications, the Committee would act on behalf of the General Assembly in conformity with the budgetary process in force and with full respect for the mandates of other bodies.

— To determine, and recommend to the General Assembly, ways and means that might ensure the optimum utilization of conference facilities and services, including documentation.

— To advise the General Assembly on the current and future requirements of the organization for conference services, facilities and documentation.

— To make recommendations, as appropriate, to the General Assembly on means to ensure an improved coordination of conferences within the UN system.

— To monitor implementation of all General Assembly resolutions on the organization, servicing and documentation for meetings and conferences.

— To monitor the organization's policy on publications, with the assistance of the publications board, and taking account positions adopted by the Committee on Information and other relevant bodies.

— To report annually thereon to the General Assembly.

With respect to the Committee's consideration of its future size and composition, discussion centered around a proposal to increase the size of the Committee by two seats from 22 to 24, with one additional seat going to the African group and the other to rotate between the African and Asian groups. While this proposal appeared to enjoy the support of the Committee, in the final hours, Algeria objected because it felt that the number of seats allotted to the African group was insufficient. Accordingly, the Committee was unable to submit any specific recommendation to the General Assembly on this matter although all Committee members agreed that the size of the Committee should not be substantially modified.

Other actions taken by the Committee at the session during the period August 17–26 included recommending to the General Assembly that the Committee on Conferences should be retained, as a permanent subsidiary body of the General Assembly. Committee members would be appointed for a term of office of up to 3 years, with one-third of the members retiring each year; that members should be eligible for reappointment; and that the General Assembly, on the basis of existing practice, should decide on the modalities of effecting the staggering of the membership of the Committee. Also included was a recommendation to the General Assembly that it renew its appeal to member states to exercise restraint in their requests for circulation of documents and communications and a decision to request the Committee chairman to maintain his contacts with the chairmen of those bodies whose reports had exceeded 32 pages in length, stressing the need for brevity in such reports.

The Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee considered the agenda item entitled "Pattern of Conferences" at its 3rd to 6th, 45th and 46th meetings, on September 4, 6, October 11 and on December 12–13. At the 45th meeting on December 12, the Delegation of Argentina proposed a draft amendment to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which would determine the size and composition of the Committee on Conferences. The draft amendment (new draft resolution B) would establish the size of the Committee to be 21 members on the basis of the following geographical distribution: six members from African states; five members from Asian states; four members from Latin American and Caribbean states; two members from Eastern European states; and four members from Western European and other states.

On December 13 the Fifth Committee adopted, without a vote, draft resolutions A, C, D and E as contained in document A/C.5/43/L.9 (draft amendments to the draft resolution of the Committee on Conferences). At the same meeting, the Committee voted on part B as a whole with 91 in favor, 3 (U.S.) against, and 13 abstentions. The Fifth Committee also decided to inform the General Assembly that action on draft resolution B in the report of the Committee on Conferences was being taken on the understanding that nothing in sub-paragraph 4(c) of that draft resolution should be construed as giving the Committee on Conferences any role in the budgetary process or authority to override decisions on programs and on meetings and conferences duly decided upon by legislative organs of the United Nations. *Inter alia*, sub-paragraph 4(c) defines the Committee's terms of reference to include examining

> . . . the Secretary General's proposals on the draft calendar prepared on the basis of his budgetary proposals and to recommend to the General Assembly a draft calendar of conferences and meetings designed to meet the needs of the United Nations and to ensure the optimum utilization of conference-servicing resources. With respect to the proposed departures from the approved calendar of conferences that have administrative and financial implications, to act on behalf of the Assembly, in conformity with the budgetary process in force and with full respect for the mandates of other bodies.

The General Assembly, on December 21, adopted, without a vote, parts A, C, D and E of resolution 43/222, Pattern of Conferences. Part B was adopted by a vote of 129 in favor, 4 (U.S.) against, and 14 abstentions. A footnote to Part B of resolution 43/222 reflects the Fifth Committee's note, cited above, concerning paragraph 4 (C).

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), a 15-member body of recognized experts, is responsible for making recommendations on salaries, allowances, and other benefits and conditions of service for employees of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Claudia Cooley, Associate Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, was the U.S. member in 1988. The Commission was in session twice, meeting for 3 weeks in Rome in March and again for 3 weeks in New York in July. The Fifth Committee considered the ICSC's 14th annual report at eight meetings between October 21 and December 18. Informal consultations preceded the introduction of the draft resolution to the full Fifth Committee.

The primary issue for discussion and debate at the two sessions of the ICSC was the comprehensive review of the compensation program for UN-system professional employees. The enormity of the assignment from the 42nd General Assembly—to assess the entire program of pay, benefits and allowances and to initiate recommendations for improving the system—struck the Commissioners during their first session. They were given only 2 years in which to accomplish this task.

The first session in 1988 was devoted primarily to defining the issues and the second session to identifying some broad alternative approaches to the comprehensive review. Thus, the report from the ICSC to the General Assembly stimulated extensive discussion in the informal sessions. The resulting draft resolution provided a framework for the ICSC to conclude its work in 1989. Key components of the framework are: (1) the overall costs should, as far as possible, be comparable to the current system, (2) the Noblemaire principle should remain the key philosophical base to the system, (3) the U.S. Civil Service should continue to serve as the comparator, (4) a single world-wide salary scale should be used, and (5) incentives for mobility and hardship should be enhanced.

Besides the action on the comprehensive review, the ICSC recommended in its report a substantial increase in the education grant and the children's allowance. The increases were approved by the Fifth Committee and included in the resolution on the Common System.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 43/226 on the Report of the International Civil Service Commission.

PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

Various personnel questions were considered at 15 meetings of the Fifth Committee between October 24 and December 18; 43 states took part in the debate. Two resolutions were ultimately adopted on December 21, both without a vote.

The first resolution (43/224) had four parts: composition of the Secretariat, administration of justice in the Secretariat (staff-management relations), improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat and working languages of the Secretariat and language training.

The focus of the section on composition of the Secretariat was the concern of the member states that there should be equitable geographical distribution of the professional posts, including in the upper echelons. The Secretary General was urged to give priority in recruitment and hiring to nationals from under-represented states, and he was requested to ensure that the overall staff reductions being implemented in response to the reform resolution (see p. 307) did not cause any geographical imbalances. In other provisions, the Secretary General was urged to intensify his efforts toward a comprehensive career development plan, increased mobility of staff and strengthened training and retraining capabilities of the Secretariat. (Resolution 43/224 A.)

The administration of justice within the UN Secretariat has for several years been strongly criticized by both staff and member states for its cumbersome procedures, over-elaborate machinery, and resultant long delays in reaching decisions. The Secretary General has sought to streamline the system, and he reported to the Assembly in 1988 that the backlog of pending cases before the Joint Appeals Board in New York had been reduced to 48, the lowest total since 1972. He predicted that by year's end there would be only current cases on the books. Similar progress was reported for other UN cities. The General Assembly welcomed the improvement in the internal justice system and requested the Secretary General to complete his reform of both the appeals and the disciplinary system by the end of 1989. (Resolution 43/224 B.)

In a related matter, the question of revising the statute of the UN Administrative Tribunal to strengthen its operation, the General Assembly once again failed to take action. The 42nd Assembly had called for intersessional consultations on the proposed amendments which the Secretary General had put forward for several years without action by the Assembly. These consultations were carried out in the first half of 1988. The states which took part in this review, including the United States, succeeded in improving and strengthening the proposed changes which were subsequently submitted by the Secretary General to the 43Rd Assembly. However, the general membership of the Fifth Committee was unwilling to endorse this work in which most had not taken part. Therefore, the Assembly on December 21, without a vote, invited member states to submit by May 31, 1989, written comments on the current proposals, "including drafting suggestions," which would be submitted by the Secretary General to the 44th Assembly "for its final decision." (Decision 43/452.)

The portion of the omnibus resolution dealing with women focused narrowly on their status in the UN Secretariat. It repeated exhortations from earlier resolutions urging greater efforts to ensure the employment of more women, in higher grades and from a wider range of countries (particularly the developing countries), and it reaffirmed the goal of having 30 percent of the professional posts filled by women by 1990. (Resolution 43/224 C.)

The last part of the omnibus resolution stressed the importance of language capability in the Secretariat, urged staff members to broaden their knowledge of all languages of the organization and—by inference—urged equality of treatment to those staff members who chose to use one of the approved but less prevalent working languages. Member states were invited to continue making voluntary contributions to improve and extend the language training facilities of the United Nations. (Resolution 43/224 D.)

Finally, the resolution adopted on the privileges and immunities of international civil servants was very similar to those adopted in earlier years. In its principal paragraphs it reiterated the Assembly's concern for the safety of international civil servants in all the organizations of the UN system, deplored the growing number of cases in which staff have been placed in jeopardy and called on member states to respect the privileges and immunities of the officials concerned. (Resolution 43/225.)

UN PENSION SYSTEM

The United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (UNJSPF) was established in 1949 to provide retirement, death, disability and related benefits for employees of the United Nations and other organizations of the UN Common

System. There are 16 international organizations in the Fund and about 53,900 participants. The Fund has assets of approximately $6 billion.

As a cost-saving measure, the full Board of the UNJSPF did not meet in 1988. The Standing Committee met on the Board's behalf at the UN Office at Geneva from June 20 to 24. Major items for discussion were: (1) the continuing review of measures to restore the long-term actuarial balance of the Fund, (2) methods and assumptions to be used in the actuarial valuation of the Fund at the end of 1988 and (3) the impact of currency fluctuations on pensionable remuneration and consequent pension benefits.

The Fifth Committee briefly considered the report submitted by the Standing Committee on behalf of the Board at five meetings between October 21 and November 21. There was little discussion of the report.

The Fifth Committee recommended a resolution that in large part simply noted the report made on behalf of the Board and urged the Board to continue studying all possible measures to restore the actuarial balance of the Fund. The General Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote on December 21, 1988. (Resolution 43/227.)

EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICANS

Americans are employed throughout the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in both the professional and general services categories.

The following chart shows Americans employed in the UN and specialized agencies as of December 31, 1988.

**AMERICANS EMPLOYED IN THE UNITED NATIONS
AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES - 12/31/88**

	Total	Professionals		U.S.	Gen. Services		U.S.
Organization	Employees	Total	U.S.	Percent	Total	U.S.	Percent
UN-Secretariat	13250	4721	543	11.5	8529	988	11.6
UNDP	5548	1062	150	14.1	4486	121	2.7
UNHCR	2170	738	59	8.0	1432	17	1.2
UNICEF	4116	1620	204	12.6	2496	135	5.4
FAO	5591	2198	144	6.6	3393	60	1.8
IAEA	1817	717	112	15.6	1100	57	5.2
ICAO	787	288	22	7.6	499	5	1.0
ILO	1733	716	58	8.1	1017	15	1.5
IMO	310	123	3	2.4	187	2	1.1
ITU	753	299	19	6.4	454	8	1.8
UNESCO*	2768	1031	65	6.3	1737	34	2.0
UNIDO	1232	413	39	9.4	819	33	4.0
WHO**	4578	1539	166	10.8	3039	44	1.5
WIPO	318	107	4	3.7	211	3	1.4
WMO	274	127	9	7.1	147	1	0.7

* The US withdrew from UNESCO in December 1984.
** Includes IARC.

In the UN Secretariat, there are many Americans in administrative and management positions, including some at senior levels. They are also represented, but are less numerous, in the political, economic and social areas. In the specialized agencies, Americans are found both at headquarters and in the field, in policy-making and operational positions.

In order to achieve a geographically balanced workforce, the UN Secretariat and some of the specialized agencies have developed formulas, based on factors such as assessed contribution and population, to establish a desirable range of positions for each member state. Most professional positions are subject to "geographic distribution;" a relatively small number of positions, such as interpreter or translator, are excluded from this process.

In terms of these formulas, the United States is adequately represented only in the UN Secretariat, UNICEF and UNDP, all located in New York. In most of the specialized agencies, located overseas, the number of American staff is below—often far below—the quota or "desirable range" specified for the United States.

PERSONNEL STATISTICS
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN PROFESSIONAL STAFF—12/88

UN AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES WITH GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION FORMULAS

Organization	Percentage of U.S. Contribution to Assessed Budgets	Posts Subject to Geographic Distribution Authorized / Filled		U.S Desirable Range or Quota	Americans in Posts Subject to Geographic Distribution
UN	25.00	N/A	2489	327 – 442	383
FAO	25.00	1,037	835	194 – 260	71
ICAO	25.00	289	223	47	19
ILO	25.00	N/A	650	112 – 150	54
UNIDO	25.00	N/A	330	49 – 66	32
WHO	25.00	1,450	1191	174 – 237	157
WIPO	5.48	N/A	86	6 – 8*	4
IAEA	25.00	N/A	607	126 – 210	97

UN SPECIALIZED AGENCIES WITHOUT SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION FORMULAS

Organization	Percentage of U.S. Contribution to Assessed Budgets	All Professional Posts	Americans in Professional Posts	
			Number	Percent
IMO	5.35	123	3	2.4
ITU	7.67	299	19	6.4
UPU	5.11	59	1	1.7
WMO	24.64	102	8	7.8

---

*Desirable range is for North America. Canada has one of the positions.

We attribute this under-representation in the specialized agencies to various factors.

— Insufficient effort on the part of UN agency leaders to redress imbalances and take the steps required to achieve the desired geographic distribution. The Secretariats of the UN agencies are under continuous pressures from the various members to appoint more of their nationals. There is a system-wide emphasis on recruiting more nationals from developing countries, which also tend to be under-represented.

— Geographic and language constraints. With most of the specialized agencies headquartered in Europe, distance and language requirements make it more difficult for Americans to compete.

— UN organizations have difficulty competing with U.S. private industry salaries and career opportunities to attract and retain the best American candidates. This is particularly true in fields such as law, medicine, scientific research, engineering and business administration.

To help UN agencies correct this imbalance, the U.S. Government recruits qualified citizens to compete for UN job openings. During the past 2 years, our recruiting efforts have been constrained because of the organizations' budgetary problems. Shortfalls in U.S. assessed contributions adversely affected our ability to lobby effectively for U.S. candidates. In 1988, with fewer vacancies and redeployment of staff due to budget pressures, a large share of the openings were filled from within the agencies.

In general, in 1988 most agencies did not hire or promote Americans at a rate which would measurably increase U.S. representation. If the United States restores full funding, we expect there to be more opportunities for recruitment in 1989. We have urged agencies in which U.S. under-representation is severe to address the problem by setting elevated hiring goals for Americans.

Appendix 1

Address by President Reagan at the 43rd Regular Session of the General Assembly

Statement before the 43rd session of the UN General Assembly on September 26, 1988

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates. Half a world away—far from this place of peace—the firing, the killing, the bloodshed in two merciless conflicts have for the first time in recent memory diminished. After adding terrible new names to the roll call of human horror—names such as Halabja, Maidan Shahr and Spin Buldak—there is today hope of peace in the Persian Gulf and Afghanistan.

So, too, in the highlands and coastal cities of southern Africa—places of civil war, places of occupation by foreign troops—talk of peace is heard, peace for the tortured nation of Angola. Six thousand five hundred miles further east, in the Southeast Asian country of Cambodia, there is hope now of a settlement, hope now of the removal of Vietnam's occupying forces. And finally in this hemisphere, where only 12 years ago one-third of the people of Latin America lived under democratic rule, some 90 percent do so today; and especially in Central America, nations such as El Salvador, once threatened by the anarchy of the death squad and the specter of totalitarian rule, now know the hope of self government and the prospect of economic growth.

And, another change, Mr. Secretary General. A change that if it endures may go down as one of the signal accomplishments of our history—a change that is cause for shaking of the head in wonder—is also upon us. A change going to the source of post-war tensions, and the once seemingly impossible dream of ending the twin threats of our time—totalitarianism and thermonuclear world war.

For the first time, the differences between East and West—fundamental differences over important moral questions dealing 'with the worth of the individual and whether governments shall control people or people control governments—for the first time, these differences have shown signs of easing. Easing to the point where there are not just troop withdrawals from places like Afghanistan but also talk in the East of reform and greater freedom of press, of assembly and of religion. Yes, fundamental differences remain. But should talk of reform become more than that, should it become reality—there is the prospect of not only a new era in Soviet-American relations but a new age of world peace. For such reform can bring peace; history teaches and my country has always believed that where the rights of the individual and the people are enshrined, war is a distant prospect; for it is not people who make war, governments do that.

I stand at this podium then in a moment of hope. Hope, not just for the peoples of the United States or the Soviet Union but for all the peoples of the world. And hope, too, for the dream of peace among nations, the dream that began the United Nations. Precisely because of these changes, today, the United Nations has the opportunity to live and breathe and work as never before. Already, you, Mr. Secretary General, through your persistence, patience, and unyielding will, have shown, in working toward peace in Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf, how valuable the United Nations can be. We salute you for those accomplishments.

And in Geneva at this very hour, there are numerous negotiations underway: Multilateral negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament as well as bilateral negotiations on a range of issues between the Soviets and ourselves. And these negotiations, some of them under UN auspices, involve a broad arms control agenda; strategic offensive weapons; strategic defense and space; nuclear testing; and chemical warfare —whose urgency we have witnessed anew in recent days.

And, Mr. Secretary General, the negotiators are busy—and over the last few years they have been engaged in more than an academic exercise. There is movement. The logjam is broken. Only recently, when the United States and the Soviet Union signed the INF agreement, an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear missiles was eliminated for the first time in history. Progress continues on negotiations to reduce, in massive number, strategic weapons with effective verification. And talks will begin soon on conventional reductions in Europe.

Much of the reason for all of this goes back, I believe, to Geneva itself; to the small chateau along the lake where I and the General Secretary of the Soviet Union had the first of several fireside chats—exchanges characterized by frankness, but friendliness, too. I said at the first meeting in Geneva that this was a unique encounter between two people who had the power to start World War III or to begin a new age of peace among nations. And I also said peace conferences, arms negotiations, proposals for treaties could make sense only if they were part of a wider context—a context that sought to explore and resolve the deeper, underlying differences between us. I said to Mr. Gorbachev then, as I have said to you before. Nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed, they are armed because they mistrust each other.

In that place, by that peaceful lake in neutral Switzerland, Mr. Gorbachev and I did begin a new relationship based not just on engagement over the single issue of arms control, but on a broader agenda about our deeper differences; an agenda of human rights, regional conflicts and bilateral exchanges between our peoples. Even on the arms control issue itself, we agreed to go beyond the past. To seek not just treaties that permit building weapons to higher levels, but revolutionary agreements that actually reduced, and even eliminated, a whole class of nuclear weapons.

What was begun that morning in Geneva has shown results. In the INF treaty. In my recent visit to Moscow. In my opportunity to meet there with Soviet citizens and dissidents and speak of human rights. And to speak, too, in the Lenin Hills of Moscow to the young people of the Soviet Union about the wonder and splendor of human freedom. The results of that morning in Geneva are seen in peace conferences now under way around the world on regional conflicts; and in the work of the United Nations here in New York as well as in Geneva.

But Mr. Secretary General, history teaches caution: indeed, that very building in Geneva, where important negotiations have taken place—the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq negotiations, for example—we see it today as stone-like testimony to a failed dream of peace in another time. The

Palais des Nations was the headquarters of the League of Nations—an institution that was to symbolize an end to all war. And yet that institution and its noble purpose ended with the Second World War, ended because the chance for peace was not seized in the 1930's by the nations of the world, ended because humanity did not find the courage to isolate the aggressors, to reject schemes of government that serve the state, not the people.

We are here today, Mr. Secretary General, determined that no such fate shall befall the United Nations. We are determined that the United Nations should succeed and serve the cause of peace for humankind.

So, Mr. Secretary General, we realize that, even in this time of hope, the chance of failure is real. But this knowledge does not discourage us. It spurs us on. For the stakes are high: Do we falter and fail now and bring down upon ourselves the just anger of future generations? Or do we continue the work of the founders of this institution and see to it that, at last, freedom is enshrined and humanity knows war no longer. And that this place, this floor shall be truly "the world's last battlefield."

We are determined it shall be so. So we turn now to the agenda of peace. Let us begin by addressing a concern that was much on my mind when I met with Mr. Gorbachev in the Kremlin as well as on the minds of Soviet citizens I met in Moscow. It is also an issue that I know is of immediate importance to the delegates of this Assembly who, this fall, commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

That declaration says plainly what those who seek peace can forget only at the greatest peril, that peace rests on one foundation: Observing "the inalienable rights of all members of the human family." In a century where human rights have been denied by totalitarian governments on a scale never before seen in history—with so many millions deliberately starved or eliminated as a matter of state policy—a history, it has been said, of blood, stupidity and barbed wire—few can wonder why peace has proved so elusive.

Let us understand. If we would have peace, we must acknowledge the elementary rights of our fellow human beings. In our own lands. If we would have peace, the trampling of the human spirit must cease. Human rights is not for some, some of the time. Human rights, as the universal declaration of this Assembly adopted in 1948 proclaims, is: "For all people and all nations." And for all time.

This regard for human rights as the foundation of peace is at the heart of the United Nations. Those who starve in Ethiopia, those who die among the Kurds, those who face racial injustice in South Africa, those who still cannot write or speak freely in the Soviet Union, those who cannot worship in the Ukraine, those who struggle for life and freedom on boats in the South China Sea, those who cannot publish or assemble in Managua—all of this is more than just an agenda item on your calendar. It must be a first concern; an issue above others. For when human rights concerns are not paramount at the United Nations—when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not honored in these halls and meeting rooms—then the very credibility of this organization is at stake, the very purpose of its existence in question.

That is why when human rights progress is made, the United Nations grows stronger and the United States is glad of it. Following a 2 year effort led by the United States, for example, the UN Human Rights Commission took a major step toward ending the double standards and cynicism that had characterized too much of its past. For years, Cuba, a blatant violator of its citizens' human rights, has escaped UN censure or even scrutiny. This year, Cuba has responded to pressure generated by the Human Rights Commission by accepting an investigation into its human rights abuses. Fidel Castro has already begun to free some political prisoners, improve prison conditions and tolerate the existence of a small, independent national human rights group.

More must be done; the United Nations must be relentless and unyielding in seeking change. In Cuba and elsewhere. And we must also see to it that the universal declaration itself should not be debased with episodes like the "Zionism is Racism" resolution. Respect for human rights is the first and fundamental mission of this body, the most elementary obligation of its members. Indeed, wherever one turns in the world today there is new awareness, a growing passion for human rights—the people of the world grow united; new groups, new coalitions form; coalitions that monitor government, that work against discrimination, that fight religious or political repression, unlawful imprisonment, torture or execution. As those I spoke to at Spaso House said to me last June: Such movements make a difference.

Turning now to regional conflicts, we feel again the uplift of hope. In the Gulf War between Iran and Iraq—one of the bloodiest conflicts since World War II—we have a cease-fire. The resolution and the firmness of the allied nations in keeping the Persian Gulf open to international shipping not only upheld the rule of law, it helped prevent further spread of the conflict and laid the basis for peace. So, too, the Security Council's decisive resolution in July a year ago has become the blueprint for a peaceful Gulf. Let this war—a war in which there has been no victor or vanquished, only victims—let this war end now. Let both Iran and Iraq cooperate with the Secretary General and the Security Council in implementing resolution 598. Let peace come.

Moving on to a second region—when I first addressed the United Nations General Assembly in 1983, world attention was focused on the brutal invasion and illegal occupation of Afghanistan. After nearly 9 long years of war, the courage and determination of the Afghan people and the Afghan freedom fighters have held sway—today, an end to the occupation is in sight. On April 14, the U.S.S.R. signed the Geneva Accords, which were negotiated under UN auspices by Pakistan and the Kabul regime. We encourage the Soviet Union to complete its troop withdrawal at the earliest possible date so that the Afghan people can freely determine their future without further outside interference.

In southern Africa, too, years of patient diplomacy and support for those in Angola who seek self-determination are having their effect. We look forward to an accord between the governments of Angola, Cuba and South Africa that will bring about a complete withdrawal of all foreign troops—primarily Cuba—from Angola. We look forward as well to full implementation of UN Security Council resolution 435 and our longstanding goal of independence for Namibia. We continue to support a growing consensus among African leaders who also believe there can be no end to conflict in the region until there is national reconciliation within Angola.

Mr. Secretary General, there are new hopes for Cambodia, a nation whose freedom and independence we seek just as avidly as we sought the freedom and independence of Afghanistan. We urge the rapid removal of all Vietnamese troops and a settlement that will prevent the return of the Khmer Rouge to power, permitting instead the establishment of a genuinely representative government—a government that will, at last, respect fully the rights of the people of Cambodia and end the hideous suffering they have so bravely and needlessly borne.

In other critical areas, we applaud the Secretary General's efforts to structure a referendum on the Western Sahara. And in the Mediterranean, direct talks between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities hold much promise for accord in that divided island nation. Finally, we look to a peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. So, too, the unnatural division of Europe remains a critical obstacle to Soviet-American relations.

In most of these areas, then, we see progress and, again, we are glad of it. Only a few years ago, Mr. Secretary General, all of these and other conflicts were burning dangerously out of control. Indeed, the invasion of Afghanistan and the apparent failure of will among democratic and peace-loving nations to deter such events seemed to cause a climate where aggression by nations large and small was epidemic, a climate the world had not seen since the 1930's. Only this time, larger war was avoided, avoided because the free and peaceful nations of the world recovered their strength of purpose and will. And now the United Nations is providing valuable assistance in helping this epidemic to recede.

And because we are resolved to keep it so, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not now take note here at the one exception to progress in regional conflicts. I refer here to the continuing deterioration of human rights in Nicaragua and the refusal of the tiny elite now ruling that nation to honor promises of democracy made to their own people and to the international community. This elite—in calling itself revolutionary—seeks no real revolution; the use of the term is subterfuge, deception for hiding the oldest, most corrupt vice of all—man's age-old will to power, his lust to control the lives and steal the freedom of others.

That is why, as President, I will continue to urge the Congress and the American public to stand behind those who resist this attempt to impose a totalitarian regime on the people of Nicaragua; that the United States will continue to stand with those who are threatened by this regime's aggression against its neighbors in Central America.

Today, I also call on the Soviet Union to show in Central America the same spirit of constructive realism it has shown in other regional conflicts. To assist in bringing conflict in Central America to a close by halting the flow of billions of dollars worth of arms and ammunition to the Sandinista regime, a regime whose goals of regional domination—while ultimately doomed—can continue to cause great suffering to the people of that area and risk to Soviet-American relations. Unless action is taken now.

Moving now to the arms reduction agenda, I have mentioned already the importance of the INF treaty and the momentum developed in the START negotiations. The draft START treaty is a lengthy document, filled with bracketed language designating sections of disagreement between the two sides. But through this summer in Geneva, those brackets have diminished; there is every reason to believe this process can continue. I can tell this Assembly that it is highly doubtful such a treaty can be accomplished in a few months, but I can tell you a year from now is a possibility, more than a possibility. But we have no deadline. No agreement is better than a bad agreement. The United States remains hopeful and we acknowledge the spirit of cooperation shown by the Soviet Union in these negotiations. We also look for that spirit to be applied to our concerns about compliance with existing agreements.

So, too, our discussions on nuclear testing and defense and space have been useful. But let me here stress to the

General Assembly that much of the momentum in nuclear arms control negotiations is due to technological progress itself, especially in the potential for space-based defensive systems. I believe that the U.S. determination to research and develop and, when ready, deploy such defensive systems—systems targeted to destroy missiles, not people—accounts for a large share of the progress made in recent years in Geneva. With such systems, for the first time, in case of accidental launch or the act of a madman somewhere, major powers will not be faced with the single option of massive retaliation, but will instead have the chance of a saner choice—to shield against an attack instead of avenging it. So, too, as defensive systems grow in effectiveness, they reduce the threat and the value of greater and greater offensive arsenals. Only recently, briefings I have received in the Oval Office indicate that progress toward such systems may be even more rapid and less costly than we had at first thought. Today, the United States reaffirms its commitment to its Strategic Defense Initiative and our offer to share the benefits of strategic defenses with others.

And yet, even as diplomatic and technological progress holds out the hope of at last diminishing the awful cloud of nuclear terror we have lived under in the post-war era, even at this moment another ominous terror is loose once again in the world. A terror we thought the world had put behind, a terror that looms at us now from the long, buried past; from ghostly, scarring trenches and the haunting, wan faces of millions dead in one of the most inhumane conflicts of all time.

Poison gas. Chemical warfare. Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates, the terror of it. The horror of it. We condemn it. The use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war—beyond its tragic human toll—jeopardizes the moral and legal strictures that have held these weapons in check since World War I. Let this tragedy spark reaffirmation of the Geneva protocol outlawing the use of chemical weapons. I call upon the signatories to that protocol, as well as other concerned states, to convene a conference to consider actions that we can take together to reverse the serious erosion of this treaty. And we urge all nations to cooperate in negotiating a verifiable, truly global ban on chemical weapons at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

It is incumbent upon all civilized nations to ban, once and for all—and on a verifiable and global basis—the use of chemical and gas warfare.

Finally, Mr. Secretary General, we must redouble our efforts to stop further proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. Likewise, proliferation in other high-technology weapons such as ballistic missiles is reaching global proportions, exacerbating regional rivalries in ways that can have global implications. The number of potential suppliers is growing at an alarming rate and more must be done to halt the spread of these weapons. This was a matter of discussion last week between Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Talks between American and Soviet experts begin on this today. And we hope to see a multilateral effort, to avoid having areas of tension like the Middle East become even more deadly battlegrounds than they already are.

But in most of these areas, we see not only progress but also the potential for an increasingly vital role for multilateral efforts and institutions like the United Nations. That is why now more than ever the United Nations must continue to increase its effectiveness through budget and program reform. The United Nations already is enacting sweeping measures affecting personnel reductions, budgeting by consensus and the establishment of program priorities. These actions are extremely important. The progress on reforms has allowed me to release funds withheld under congressional restrictions. I expect the reform program will continue and that further funds will be released in our new fiscal year.

And let me say here we congratulate the United Nations on the work it has done in three areas of special concern. First, our struggle against the scourge of terrorism and state-sponsored terrorism must continue. And we must also end the scourge of hostage taking. Second, the work of the World Health Organization in coordinating and advancing research on AIDS is vital. All international efforts in this area must be redoubled. The AIDS crisis is a grave one; we must move as one to meet it.

So, too, is the drug crisis. We are moving now toward a new anti-drug trafficking convention. This important treaty will be completed in December. I am confident other strong UN drug control programs will also follow. The American people are profoundly concerned, deeply angered. We will not tolerate the drug traffickers. We mean to make war on them—and we believe this is one war the United Nations can endorse and participate in.

Yes, the United Nations is a better place than it was 8 years ago—but so too is the world. But the real issue of reform in the United Nations is not limited just to fiscal and administrative improvements but also to a higher sort of reform, an intellectual and philosophical reform, a reform of old views about the relationship between the individual and the state.

Few developments, for example, have been more encouraging to the United States than the special session this body held on Africa 2 1/2 years ago. A session in which the United Nations joined as one in a call for free market incentives and a lessening of state controls to spur economic development.

At one of the first international assemblies of my Presidency in Cancun, Mexico, I said history demonstrates that time and again, in place after place, economic growth and human progress make their greatest strides in countries that encourage economic freedom. That individual farmers, laborers, owners, traders and managers are the heart and soul of development. Trust them. Because where they are allowed to create and build, where they are given a personal stake in deciding economic policies and benefitting from their success, then societies become more dynamic, prosperous, progressive and free. We believe in freedom. We know it works.

And this, Mr. Secretary General and distinguished delegates, is the immutable lesson of the postwar era: That freedom works. Even more, that freedom and peace work together. Every year that passes, everywhere in the world, this lesson is taking hold, from the People's Republic of China to Cameroon, from Bolivia to Botswana, and, yes, in the citadel of Marxism-Leninism itself. No, my country did not invent this synergy of peace and freedom but, believe me, we impose no restrictions on the free export of our more than two centuries of experience with it. Free people blessed by economic opportunity and protected by laws that respect the dignity of the individual are not driven toward war or the domination of others. Here, then, is the way to world peace.

And yet, we Americans champion freedom not only because it is practical and beneficial but because it is also just, morally right. And here, Mr. Secretary General, I hope you will permit me to note that I have addressed this assemblage more than any of my predecessors and that this will be the last occasion I will do so. So, I hope too I may be permitted now some closing reflections.

The world is currently witnessing another celebration of international cooperation; at the Olympics we see nations joining together in the competition of sports and we see young people, who know precious little of the resentments of their elders, coming together as one.

One of our young athletes—from a home of modest means—said that she drew the strength for her achievement from another source of wealth—"we were rich as a family," she said about the love she was given and values she was taught.

Mr. Secretary General, I dare to hope that in the sentiment of that young athlete, we see a sign of the rediscovery of old and tested values, values such as family—the first and most important unit of society where all values and learning begin, an institution to be cherished and protected. Values, too, such as work, community, freedom and faith. For it is here we find the deeper rationale for the cause of human rights and world peace.

And our own experience on this continent, the American experience, though brief, has had one unmistakable encounter, an insistence on the preservation of one sacred truth. It is a truth that our first President, our Founding Father, passed on in the first farewell address made to the American people. It is a truth that I hope now you will permit me to mention in these remarks of farewell.

A truth embodied in our Declaration of Independence—that the case for inalienable rights, that the idea of human dignity, that the notion of conscience above compulsion can be made only in the context of higher law, a higher order. Only in the context of what one of the founders of this organization, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, has called "devotion to something which is greater and higher than we are ourselves."

This is the endless cycle, the final truth to which humankind seems always to return. That religion and morality, that faith in something higher, are prerequisites for freedom. And that justice and peace within ourselves is the first step toward justice and peace in the world and for the ages.

Yes, this is a place of great debate and grave discussion, and yet I cannot help but note here that one of our Founding Fathers, the most worldly of men and an internationalist, Benjamin Franklin, interrupted the proceedings of our own Constitutional Convention to make much the same point.

And I cannot help but think this morning of other beginnings. Of where and when I first read those words, "and they shall beat their swords into plowshares . . ." and "your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams . . ." This morning, my thoughts go to her who gave me many things in life but whose most important gift was the knowledge of the happiness and solace to be gained in prayer. It is the greatest help I have had in my Presidency and I recall here Lincoln's words when he said only the most foolish of men would think he could confront the duties of the office I now hold without turning to someone stronger, a power above all others.

I think then of her and others like her in that small town in Illinois, gentle people who possessed something that those who hold positions of power sometimes forget to prize. No, none of them could ever have imagined the boy from the banks of the Rock River would come to this moment and have this opportunity. But had they been told it would happen, I think they would have been a bit disappointed if I had not spoken here for what they knew so well: That when we grow weary of the world and its troubles, when our faith in humanity falters, it is then we must seek comfort—and refreshment of spirit, in a deeper source of wisdom, one greater than ourselves.

And so if future generations do say of us that, in our time, peace came closer, that we did bring about new seasons of truth and justice, it will be cause for pride. But it shall be a cause of greater pride still, if it is also said that we were wise enough to know the deliberations of great leaders and great bodies are but overtures; that the truly majestic music—the music of freedom, of justice and peace—is the music made in forgetting self and seeking in silence the will of Him who made us.

Thank you for your hospitality over the years. I bid you now farewell.

Appendix 2

Principal Organs of the United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The General Assembly is composed of all 159 members. They are:

Member	Date of Admission	Member	Date of Admission
Afghanistan	Nov. 19, 1946	Chad	Sept. 20, 1960
Albania	Dec. 14, 1955	Chile	Oct. 24, 1945
Algeria	Oct. 8, 1962	China*	Oct. 24, 1945
Angola	Dec. 1, 1976	Colombia	Nov. 5, 1945
Antigua and Barbuda	Nov. 11, 1981	Comoros	Nov. 12, 1975
Argentina	Oct. 24, 1945	Congo	Sept. 20, 1960
Australia	Nov. 1, 1945	Costa Rica	Nov. 2, 1945
Austria	Dec. 14, 1955	Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast)	Sept. 20, 1960
Bahamas	Sept. 18, 1973	Cuba	Oct. 24, 1945
Bahrain	Sept. 21, 1971	Cyprus	Sept. 20, 1960
Bangladesh	Sept. 17, 1974	Czechoslovakia	Oct. 24, 1945
Barbados	Dec. 9, 1966	Denmark	Oct. 24, 1945
Belgium	Dec. 27, 1945	Djibouti	Sept. 20, 1977
Belize	Sept. 25, 1981	Dominica	Dec. 18, 1978
Benin	Sept. 20, 1960	Dominican Republic	Oct. 24, 1945
Bhutan	Sept. 21, 1971	Ecuador	Dec. 21, 1945
Bolivia	Nov. 14, 1945	Egypt	Oct. 24, 1945
Botswana	Oct. 17, 1966	El Salvador	Oct. 24, 1945
Brazil	Oct. 24, 1945	Equatorial Guinea	Nov. 12, 1968
Brunei Darussalam	Sept. 21, 1984	Ethiopia	Nov. 13, 1945
Bulgaria	Dec. 14, 1955	Fiji	Oct. 13, 1970
Burkina Faso	Sept. 20, 1960	Finland	Dec. 14, 1955
Burma	Apr. 19, 1948	France	Oct. 24, 1945
Burundi	Sept. 18, 1962	Gabon	Sept. 20, 1960
Byelorussian S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945	Gambia	Sept. 21, 1965
Cameroon	Sept. 20, 1960	German Democratic Republic	Sept. 18, 1973
Canada	Nov. 9, 1945	Germany, Federal Republic of	Sept. 18, 1973
Cape Verde	Sept. 16, 1975	Ghana	Mar. 8, 1957
Central African Republic	Sept 20, 1960	Greece	Oct. 25, 1945

---

*By resolution 2758 (XXVI) of October 25, 1971, the General Assembly decided "to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations."

Grenada	Sept. 17, 1974
Guatemala	Nov. 21, 1945
Guinea	Dec. 12, 1958
Guinea-Bissau	Sept. 17, 1974
Guyana	Sept. 20, 1966
Haiti	Oct. 24, 1945
Honduras	Dec. 17, 1945
Hungary	Dec. 14, 1955
Iceland	Nov. 19, 1946
India	Oct. 30, 1945
Indonesia	Sept. 28, 1950
Iran	Oct. 24, 1945
Iraq	Dec. 21, 1945
Ireland	Dec. 14, 1955
Israel	May 11, 1949
Italy	Dec. 14, 1955
Jamaica	Sept. 18, 1962
Japan	Dec. 18, 1956
Jordan	Dec. 14, 1955
Kampuchea	Dec. 14, 1955
Kenya	Dec. 16, 1963
Kuwait	May 14, 1963
Laos	Dec. 14, 1955
Lebanon	Oct. 24, 1945
Lesotho	Oct. 17, 1966
Liberia	Nov. 2, 1945
Libya	Dec. 14, 1955
Luxembourg	Oct. 24, 1945
Madagascar	Sept. 20, 1960
Malawi	Dec. 1, 1964
Malaysia	Sept. 17, 1957
Maldives	Sept. 21, 1965
Mali	Sept. 28, 1960
Malta	Dec. 1, 1964
Mauritania	Oct. 27, 1961
Mauritius	Apr. 24, 1968
Mexico	Nov. 7, 1945
Mongolia	Oct. 27, 1961
Morocco	Nov. 12, 1956
Mozambique	Sept. 16, 1975
Nepal	Dec. 14, 1955
Netherlands	Dec. 10, 1945
New Zealand	Oct. 24, 1945
Nicaragua	Oct. 24, 1945
Niger	Sept. 20, 1960
Nigeria	Oct. 7, 1960
Norway	Nov. 27, 1945
Oman	Oct. 7, 1971
Pakistan	Sept. 30, 1947
Panama	Nov. 13, 1945
Papua New Guinea	Oct. 10, 1975
Paraguay	Oct. 24, 1945
Peru	Oct. 31, 1945
Philippines	Oct. 24, 1945
Poland	Oct. 24, 1945
Portugal	Dec. 14, 1955
Qatar	Sept. 21, 1971
Romania	Dec. 14, 1955
Rwanda	Sept. 18, 1962
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Sept. 23, 1983
Saint Lucia	Sept. 18, 1979
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Sept. 16, 1980
Samoa	Dec. 15, 1976
Sao Tome and Principe	Sept. 16, 1975
Saudi Arabia	Oct. 24, 1945
Senegal	Sept. 28, 1960
Seychelles	Sept. 21, 1976
Sierra Leone	Sept. 27, 1961
Singapore	Sept. 21, 1965
Solomon Islands	Sept. 19, 1978
Somalia	Sept. 20, 1960
South Africa	Nov. 7, 1945
Spain	Dec. 14, 1955
Sri Lanka	Dec. 14, 1955
Sudan	Nov. 12, 1956
Suriname	Dec. 4, 1975
Swaziland	Sept. 24, 1968
Sweden	Nov. 19, 1946
Syria	Oct. 24, 1945
Tanzania	Dec. 14, 1961
Thailand	Dec. 16, 1946
Togo	Sept. 20, 1960
Trinidad and Tobago	Sept. 18, 1962
Tunisia	Nov. 12, 1956
Turkey	Oct. 24, 1945
Uganda	Oct. 25, 1962
Ukrainian S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945
U.S.S.R.	Oct. 24, 1945
United Arab Emirates	Dec. 9, 1971
United Kingdom	Oct. 24, 1945
United States	Oct. 24, 1945
Uruguay	Dec. 18, 1945
Vanuatu	Sept. 15, 1981
Venezuela	Nov. 15, 1945
Vietnam	Sept. 20, 1977
Yemen (Aden)	Dec. 14, 1967
Yemen (Sanaa)	Sept. 30, 1947
Yugoslavia	Oct. 24, 1945
Zaire	Sept. 20, 1960
Zambia	Dec. 1, 1964
Zimbabwe	Aug. 25, 1980

The 42nd regular session of the General Assembly, which had been suspended December 21, 1987, was resumed February 29–March 2 and March 18–23, 1988, to discuss relations with the host country. Two resolutions were adopted at the resumed sessions. The first called upon the United States as host country to abide by the Headquarters Agreement concerning the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations and referred the related arbitration question to the International Court of Justice. (Resolution 42/229.) The second reaffirmed that the Permanent Observer Mission of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations is covered by the Agreement between the United Nations and the host country and deplored the failure of the host country to comply with its obligation. (Resolution 42/230.)

On May 11–13, 1988, the 42nd General Assembly was resumed again and adopted a resolution regarding assistance to Central America (Resolution 42/231); a resolution urging the host country to abide by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (Resolution 42/232); and adopted two decisions relating to the appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. (Decisions 42/312 and 42/402.)

The 42nd General Assembly was resumed briefly August 16–17, 1988, to consider the financing of the UN Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (Resolution 42/233) and September 19, 1988, to formally close the session. It was decided to include on the provisional agenda of the 43rd session those agenda items that had not been considered at the 42nd General Assembly. Those items were: (1) armed Israeli aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations; (2) the situation in Central America; (3) the current financial crisis of the United Nation; (4) question of Cyprus; (5) and consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq. In addition, the General Assembly held a special session in 1988. The 15th special session was convened (May 31–June 25) to consider disarmament issues.

The 43rd regular session of the General Assembly convened September 20, 1988, and was suspended December 22, 1988.

The Assembly elected Dante Caputo (Argentina) as President and the Chairmen of the Delegations of Bahrain, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Guinea-Bissau, Libya, Malta, Nepal, Sao Tome and Principe, Swaziland, Tanzania, Thailand, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Vanuatu and Yugoslavia as the 21 Vice Presidents.

The Chairmen of the seven main committees, on which each member may be represented, were:

First Committee (Political and Security) — Douglas Roche (Canada)
Special Political Committee — Eugeniusz Noworyta (Poland)
Second Committee (Economic and Financial) — Hugo Navajas Mogro (Bolivia)

Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural) — Mohammad A. Abulhasan (Kuwait)

Fourth Committee (Decolonization) — Jonathan C. Peters (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines)

Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) — Michael George-Okeyo (Kenya)

Sixth Committee (Legal) — Achol Deng (Sudan)

The General Committee (steering committee) is composed of the President, the 21 Vice Presidents, and Chairmen of the Seven Committees.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council is composed of 5 members designated in the Charter as permanent and 10 members elected by the General Assembly for 2-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

Permanent Members: China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.
1988: Argentina, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Zambia.
1989: Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal, Yugoslavia.

On October 26, 1988, the Assembly elected Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, Malaysia and Finland as members of the Security Council for a 2-year term of office beginning January 1, 1989.

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

The Trusteeship Council is composed of the United States (as administrator of a territory), and the other four permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom).

The Trusteeship Council held its 55th meeting May 11–27 and a resumed session July 19, both in New York.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

ECOSOC is composed of 54 members elected by the General Assembly for 3-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

1988: Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian S.S.R., Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Mozambique, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, United States.

1989: Belize, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Iran, Norway, Oman, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Uruguay, Zaire.

1990: Colombia, Cuba, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

On October 26 and 28, 1988, the General Assembly elected Bahamas, Brazil, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian S.S.R., United States and Zambia for terms beginning on January 1, 1989.

ECOSOC held its organizational session for 1988 (February 2–5) and its first regular session (May 3–27) in New York. The second regular session of 1988 was held in Geneva (July 6–29) and a resumed session on October 17.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice consists of 15 members elected by the General Assembly and Security Council for 9-year terms ending February 5 of the year given in parenthesis. The Judges, listed in their order of precedence, are:

Jose Maria Ruda of Argentina (1991), President
Keba Mbaye of Senegal (1991), Vice President
Manfred Lachs of Poland (1994)
Nagendra Singh of India (1991)
Taslim Olawale Elias of Nigeria (1994)
Shigeru Oda of Japan (1994)
Roberto Ago of Italy (1997)
Stephen M. Schwebel of the United States (1997)
Robert Y. Jennings of the United Kingdom (1991)
Mohammed Bedjaoui of Algeria (1997)
Ni Zhengyu of China (1994)
Jens Evensen of Norway (1994)
Nikolai K. Tarassov of the U.S.S.R. (1997)
Gilbert Guillaume of France (1991)
Mohamed Shahabuddeen of Guyana (1997)

Appendix 3

United States Missions

U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK 1988

The United States is represented by a permanent mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York. Under the direction of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, the mission carries out the instructions of the President, as transmitted by the Secretary of State. It serves as the channel of communications between the U.S. Government and the UN organs, agencies and commissions at the Headquarters; with the 159 other permanent missions accredited to the United Nations; and with various nonmember observer missions. It is also a base of operations for the U.S. delegations to the General Assembly and to other UN bodies when they meet in New York.

The Chief of Mission, who has the rank of Ambassador, is the U.S. Representative to the United Nations and also represents the United States in the Security Council. He or she is assisted by other persons of appropriate title, rank and status, who are appointed by the President.

The mission staff includes specialists in political, economic, social, financial, budgetary, legal, military, public affairs and administrative matters. In 1988 about 148 persons were assigned to the mission by the Department of State and other U.S. departments and agencies.

The staff assists the U.S. Representative in such activities as (1) planning the tactical pursuit of U.S. policy objectives in UN organs and bodies; (2) carrying out consultations, negotiation and liaison with other delegations and the UN Secretariat; (3) preparing policy recommendations to the Department of State; (4) reporting to the Department of State on consultations and developments in the United Nations; (5) discharging U.S. responsibilities as "host government," in particular those arising from the 1947 Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.); the International Organizations Immunities Act of 1945, as amended; and the

Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, which deal, *inter alia*, with relations of the United Nations, its officials, and delegation members with federal, state, and local authorities; (6) carrying out public affairs activities; and (7) planning and administering conference operations.

U.S. MISSION TO THE EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, GENEVA

The United States maintains a permanent mission in Geneva under the direction of a U.S. Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, who is accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and to the UN specialized agencies and other international organizations with headquarters in Geneva. The mission is responsible for the representation of U.S. interests at the UN European headquarters; in UN subsidiary bodies located in Geneva (such as UNCTAD, UNHCR, ECE and the UN Disaster Relief Office); in the four specialized agencies which have their headquarters in Geneva (WHO, WMO, ITU and WIPO); and in other international bodies such as GATT, CD and the Inter-governmental Committee for Migration. The mission also maintains liaison, as appropriate, with resident delegations of other nations in Geneva, as well as with a large number of nongovernmental or voluntary organizations involved in humanitarian affairs, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The mission maintains liaison on a continuing basis with the executive heads and members of secretariats of international bodies, reports on developments relating to them, monitors their programs and budgets, and makes policy and program recommendations to the Department of State.

The mission staff includes economic, political, financial, budgetary, scientific, agricultural, health, public affairs, humanitarian and administrative advisers. In 1988 about 200 Americans, including personnel detailed by U.S. Government Departments other than the Department of State, were assigned to the staff, and 95 local employees were hired full time.

The Ambassador often heads or serves as alternate on delegations to large conferences, and other officers of the mission either represent the United States in smaller international meetings or serve on the U.S. Delegations to these.

OTHER U.S. MISSIONS

The United States also maintains a mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations and IAEA in Vienna, an observer mission to UNESCO in Paris, a mission to the UN Agencies for Food and Agriculture in Rome, a mission to ICAO in Montreal, and a liaison office with UNEP in Nairobi.

Appendix 4

United States Representatives

Permanent Representative and Chief of Mission to the United Nations: Vernon A. Walters

Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations: Herbert S. Okun

Deputy Permanent Representative to the Security Council: Patricia M. Byrne

Representative on the Economic and Social Council: Lester B. Korn

Alternate Permanent Representative for Special Political Affairs: Hugh Montgomery

Representative of the United States of America to the European Office of the United Nations: Joseph C. Petrone

U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Vienna: Bruce K. Chapman

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

15th special session (New York, May 31–June 25)
Representative: Vernon A. Walters
Alternate: Herbert S. Okun

43rd regular session (New York, Sept. 20–Dec. 12, Dec. 16-Dec. 22; Geneva, Dec. 13–Dec. 15)
Representatives: Vernon A. Walters* (Chairman); Herbert S. Okun (Vice-Chairman); Rudy Boschwitz; Christopher J. Dodd; Pearl Bailey
Alternates: Patricia M. Byrne; Lester B. Korn; Hugh Montgomery; Noel L. Gross; Arthur Schneier

---

*The Secretarty of State, George P. Shultz, served as chairman of the delegation, *ex officio*, during his presence at the session.

Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation
37th session (Vienna, June 6–17)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Bruce K. Chapman
Representative: Frederick A. Mettler
Alternate: Warren K. Sinclair

Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space
31st session (New York, June 13–23)
Representative: Herbert S. Okun
Alternate: William J. Lowell

Conference on Disarmament
(Geneva, Feb. 2–Apr. 29; July 7–Sept. 20)
Representative: Max L. Friedersdorf
Deputy Representative: Carl Granger

Disarmament Commission
(New York, May 2–20)
Representatives: Herbert S. Okun; Lynn Hansen
Alternates: Alexander Akalovsky; Robert Immerman

Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations
(New York, Feb. 10)
Representative: Robert B. Rosenstock
Alternate: Douglas Stevenson

UN Commission on International Trade Law
21st session (New York, Apr. 11–22)
Representative: Peter H. Pfund
Alternate: John O. Honnold

Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization
(New York, Feb. 22–Mar. 11)
Representative: Robert Rosenstock
Alternates: David Ettinger; Carolyn L. Willson

Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean
(New York, Apr. 11–15; July 11–22)
Representative: Scott Norris Thayer
Alternate: Richard L. Horne

Committee on Conferences
(New York, Aug. 17–26)
Representative: Susan M. Shearouse
Alternate: Michael Michalski

Committee on Information
10th session (New York, June 27–13)
Representative: Hugh Montgomery
Alternate: Rose S. Berstein

Resumed 10th session (New York, Sept. 8–9)
Representative: Penny Eastman
Alternate: Rose S. Berstein

Ad Hoc Committee on Drafting an International Convention Against Activities of Mercenaries
(New York, Jan. 25–Feb. 12)
Representative: Carolyn L. Willson
Alternate: Robert B. Rosenstock

Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy
(New York, Mar. 28–Apr. 8)
Representative: Harry A. Cahill
Alternates: Kevin J. Charles; A. Gordon MacArthur

SECURITY COUNCIL

Representative: Vernon A. Walters
Deputies: Herbert S. Okun; Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Robert M. Immerman; Robert B. Rosenstock

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

55th session (New York, May 10–June 3)
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Jeffrey J. Buczacki; Robert M. Immerman;
Robert B. Rosenstock

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL AND RELATED BODIES

Organizational session for 1988 (New York, Feb. 2–5)
Representative: Lester B. Korn
Alternates: Harry A. Cahill; Irvin D. Coker; George F. Saddler

1st regular session, 1988 (New York, May 3–27)
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: W. Lewis Amselem; Harry A. Cahill; Irvin D. Coker;
John Dawson; Penny Eastman; Maureen Reagan; George F. Saddler;
Ann B. Wrobleski

2nd regular session, 1988 (Geneva, July 6–29)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Vernon A. Walters
Representative: Lester B. Korn
Alternates: Harry A. Cahill; Bernard Engel; Alberto M. Piedra

Commission on Human Rights
44th session (Geneva, Feb. 1–Mar. 11)
Representative: Armando Valladares
Alternates: Marshall J. Breger; Dennis C. Goodman;
Joseph C. Petrone; Alberto M. Piedra; Maureen Reagan

Commission on Narcotic Drugs
10th special session (Vienna, Feb. 8–19)
Representative: Ann B. Wrobleski
Alternate: Bruce K. Chapman

Population Commission
Did not meet in 1988.

Commission for Social Development
Did not meet in 1988.

Statistical Commission
Did not meet in 1988.

Commission on Status of Women
32nd session (Vienna, Mar. 14–23)
Representative: Maureen Reagan
Alternates: Esther Coopersmith; Mary A. Grefe; Nancy J. Risque

Commission on Transnational Corporations
14th session (New York, Apr. 6–15)
Representative: Robert C. Reis, Jr.
Alternate: John Dawson

Economic Commission for Europe
43rd plenary session (Geneva, Apr. 12–22)
Representative: Joseph C. Petrone
Alternate: Bernard Engel

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
44th plenary session (Jakarta, Apr. 11–20)
Representatives: Eugene J. McAllister; Paul D. Wolfowitz
Alternate: Robert B. Duncan

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
22nd plenary session (Rio de Janeiro, Apr. 20–27)
Representative: Richard S. Williamson
Alternates: Thomas T Turqman; Peter Whitney;
Matthew P. Hennesey

UN Children's Fund
Executive Board (New York, Apr. 18–29)
Representative: Rita Di Martino
Alternate: Claudine B. Cox

Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations
Did not meet in 1988.

Committee for Program and Coordination
28th session (New York, May 2–June 3)
Representative: Lester B. Korn
Alternates: Kathleen Chisholm; John D. Fox; Dennis C. Goodman; Richard C. Nygard; Alberto M. Piedra

World Food Council
14th session (Cyprus, May 23–26)
Representative: Joan Wallace Dawkins
Alternate: Fred J. Eckert

Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs
26th session (Rome, December 12)
Representative: Owen Cylke
Alternate: Juanita M. Lambert

Committee on Natural Resources
Did not meet in 1988.

Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees
Executive Committee, 39th session (Geneva, Oct. 3–10)
Representative: Jonathan Moore
Alternates: Kenneth Bleakley; Joseph Petrone

Commission on Human Settlements
11th session (New Delhi, Apr. 6–12)
Representative: Peter M. Kimm
Alternates: Daniel W. Figgins, Jr.; William D. North

Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development
Did not meet in 1988.

UN Conference on Trade and Development
Trade and Development Board
34th session, Part II (Geneva, Apr. 25–May 6)
Representative: Joseph C. Petrone
Alternates: Bernard Engel; Fred Montgomery

35th session (Geneva, Sept. 19–30)
Representative: Joseph C. Petrone
Alternate: Bernard Engel

UN Development Program
Governing Council, 35th session (Geneva, June 6–July 1)
Representatives: Jay F. Morris; Nyle C. Brady; Nancy Ostrander; Joseph C. Petrone; Richard S. Williamson
Alternates: Joan Dudik-Gayoso; Sandra L. Vogelgesang

UN Environment Program
1st special session, Governing Council (Nairobi, Mar. 14–18)
Representatives: Elinor Constable; William A. Nitze
Alternates: Daniel Figgins; Edwin Johnson; Coleman J. Nee

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND IAEA

UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
Industrial Development Board, (Vienna, June 20–24)
Representative: Bruce K. Chapman
Alternates: Norman H. Frisbie; Dale E. Leach; Bernice A. Powell; Garett G. Sweany; Lucy Tamlyn

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
94th session: FAO Council (Rome, Nov. 15–25)
Representative: Fred J. Eckert
Alternates: E. Wayne Denney; Joan Dudik-Gayoso

International Maritime Organization (IMO)
Assembly: Did not meet in 1988.
Council: 60th session (London, June 20–24)
61st session (London, Nov. 21–25)
Representative: J. Anthony Allitto
Alternates: M.C. Grace; Gerard P. Yoest

World Bank Group
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)
U.S. Governor: James A. Baker III
Alternate: W. Allen Wallis
U.S. Executive: Robert B. Keating
Alternate: Mark T. Cox IV (from Aug. 11, 1988)

International Development Association (IDA)
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director, and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD.

International Finance Corporation (IFC)
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD.

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
Did not meet in 1988.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
11th session (Rome, Jan. 25–29)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Fred J. Eckert
Representative: Richard A. Bissell

International Monetary Fund (IMF
U.S. Governor: James A. Baker, III
Alternate: Alan Greenspan

International Telecommunications Union (ITU)
43rd session, Administrative Council (Geneva, June 20–July 1)
Representative: Earl S. Barbely

Universal Postal Union (UPU)
Executive Council (Bern, Apr. 18–May 4)
Advisers: Harry Montgomery; Bernice A. Powell; Joseph P. Richardson

World Health Organization (WHO)
41st World Health Assembly (Geneva, May 2–13)
Delegates: Don M. Newman; Robert E. Windom; Joseph C. Petrone
Alternates: Neil A. Boyer; Nyle C. Brady; Frank E. Young

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
Governing bodies (Geneva, Sept. 26–Oct.3)
Representative: Donald J. Quigg
Alternates: Michael K. Kirk; Harvey J. Winter

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
WMO Congress did not meet in 1988.

World Tourism Organization (WTO)
33rd session, Executive Council (Madrid, May 3–6)
Representative: Kaye Boesel
Alternate: Jean O'Brien

34th session, Executive Council (Fez, Morocco, Nov. 2–5)
Representative: J. Anthony Allitto
Alternate: Robert Bentley

International Labor Organization (ILO)
International Labor Conference (Geneva, June 1–22)
Minister: Ann Dore McLaughlin
Also attending: David Demarest; Tadd Linsenmayer; Gay Pirozzi; Ann Taylor; Lisa Walker
Delegates: Eugene K. Lawson; Anthony G. Freeman
Alternates: David A. Peterson; Joseph C. Petrone

UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
129th session, Executive Board (Paris, May 25–June 9)
130th session, Executive Board (Paris, Oct. 13–Nov. 10)
Principal Observer: Penny Eastman

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
Board of Governors (Vienna, Feb. 22–26; June 6–10)
Representative: Richard T. Kennedy
Alternate: Bruce K. Chapman

Appendix 5

Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations

The scale of assessments for the contributions of member states to the UN budget for the financial years 1986, 1987 and 1988 shall be as follows:

Member State	Percent	Member State	Percent
Afghanistan	0.01	Canada	3.06
Albania	0.01	Cape Verde	0.01
Algeria	0.14	Central African Rep.	0.01
Angola	0.01	Chad	0.01
Antigua and Barbuda	0.01	Chile	0.07
Argentina	0.62	China	0.79
Australia	1.66	Colombia	0.13
Austria	0.74	Comoros	0.01
Bahamas	0.01	Congo	0.01
Bahrain	0.02	Costa Rica	0.02
Bangladesh	0.02	Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast)	0.02
Barbados	0.01	Cuba	0.09
Belgium	1.18	Cyprus	0.02
Belize	0.01	Czechoslovakia	0.70
Benin	0.01	Democratic Kampuchea	0.01
Bhutan	0.01	Democratic Yemen	0.01
Bolivia	0.01	Denmark	0.72
Botswana	0.01	Djibouti	0.01
Brazil	1.40	Dominica	0.01
Brunei Darussalam	0.04	Dominican Republic	0.03
Bulgaria	0.16	Ecuador	0.03
Burkina Faso	0.01	Egypt	0.07
Burma	0.01	El Salvador	0.01
Burundi	0.01	Equatorial Guinea	0.01
Byelorussian S.S.R.	0.34	Ethiopia	0.01
Cameroon	0.01	Fiji	0.01

Member State	Percent	Member State	Percent
Finland	0.50	Pakistan	0.06
France	6.37	Panama	0.02
Gabon	0.03	Papua New Guinea	0.01
Gambia	0.01	Paraguay	0.02
German Dem. Rep.	1.33	Peru	0.07
Germany, Fed. Rep. of	8.26	Philippines	0.10
Ghana	0.01	Poland	0.64
Greece	0.44	Portugal	0.18
Grenada	0.01	Qatar	0.04
Guatemala	0.02	Romania	0.19
Guinea	0.01	Rwanda	0.01
Guinea-Bissau	0.01	St. Kitts and Nevis	0.01
Guyana	0.01	St. Lucia	0.01
Haiti	0.01	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	0.01
Honduras	0.01	Samoa	0.01
Hungary	0.22	Sao Tome and Principe	0.01
Iceland	0.03	Saudi Arabia	0.97
India	0.35	Senegal	0.01
Indonesia	0.14	Seychelles	0.01
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	0.63	Sierra Leone	0.01
Iraq	0.12	Singapore	0.10
Ireland	0.18	Solomon Islands	0.01
Israel	0.22	Somalia	0.01
Italy	3.79	South Africa	0.44
Jamaica	0.02	Spain	2.03
Japan	10.84	Sri Lanka	0.01
Jordan	0.01	Sudan	0.01
Kenya	0.01	Suriname	0.01
Kuwait	0.29	Swaziland	0.01
Laos	0.01	Sweden	1.25
Lebanon	0.01	Syrian Arab Republic	0.04
Lesotho	0.01	Tanzania, United Rep. of	0.01
Liberia	0.01	Thailand	0.09
Libya	0.26	Togo	0.01
Luxembourg	0.05	Trinidad and Tobago	0.04
Madagascar	0.01	Tunisia	0.03
Malawi	0.01	Turkey	0.34
Malaysia	0.10	Uganda	0.01
Maldives	0.01	Ukrainian S.S.R.	1.28
Mali	0.01	U.S.S.R.	10.20
Malta	0.01	United Arab Emirates	0.18
Mauritania	0.01	United Kingdom	4.86
Mauritius	0.01	United States	25.00
Mexico	0.89	Uruguay	0.04
Mongolia	0.01	Vanuatu	0.01
Morocco	0.05	Venezuela	0.60
Mozambique	0.01	Vietnam	0.01
Nepal	0.01	Yemen	0.01
Netherlands	1.74	Yugoslavia	0.46
New Zealand	0.24	Zaire	0.01
Nicaragua	0.01	Zambia	0.01
Niger	0.01	Zimbabwe	0.02
Nigeria	0.19		
Norway	0.54		
Oman	0.02	Grand total	100.00

In accordance with Rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, states which are not members of the United Nations but which participate in certain of its activities shall be called upon to contribute toward the 1986, 1987 and 1988 expenses of such activities on the basis of the following rates:

Non-member State	Percent	Non-member State	Percent
Holy See	0.01	Nauru	0.01
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	0.05	San Marino	0.01
Korea, Republic of	0.20	Switzerland	1.12
Liechtenstein	0.01	Tonga	0.01
Monaco	0.01	Tuvalu	0.01